DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 424 714 EC 306 819

AUTHOR	Ford, Bridgie Alexis, Ed.
TITLE	Compendium: Writings on Effective Practices for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Exceptional Learners.
INSTITUTION	Council for Exceptional Children, Reston, VA. Div. for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Exceptional Learners.
PUB DATE	1998-00-00
NOTE	121p.
PUB TYPE	Collected Works - General (020)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC05 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Cultural Awareness; *Cultural Differences; *Disabilities; Educational Innovation; Elementary Secondary Education; *Exceptional Child Research; Gifted; High Risk Students; Hispanic Americans; Inclusive Schools; International Cooperation; *Interpersonal Competence; Intervention; Language Impairments; Language Minorities; Minority Group Children; *Parent Participation; Preschool Education; Professional Development; Speech Impairments; *Speech Language Pathology
IDENTIFIERS	Mexico

ABSTRACT

Derived from two national multicultural symposia, this compendium focuses on an array of topics that combine research and educational practices for youth from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds with disabilities and/or gifts. Specific papers include: (1) "Parent-Involved Social Skill Instruction and the Perceptions of Children At Risk and Children with Normal Achievement and Development (Brenda L. Townsend and Richard L. Simpson); (2) "Participatory Action Research Involving Families from Underserved Communities and Researchers: Respecting Cultural and Linguistic Diversity" (Ursula Markey and others); (3) "Promoting Inclusion through Exito: An Integrated Assessment and Instruction Professional Development Model" (J. S. de Valenzuela and others); (4) "Intervention Strategies for CLD Students with Speech-Language Disorders" (Li-Rong Lilly Cheng); (5) "A Study of Effective Instructional Practices by Monolingual English Speaking and Bilingual/Bicultural Teachers in Five Programs Serving Hispanic Preschoolers with Developmental Disabilities" (Joze De Leon and Laurie L. McCarty); (6) "What Do Reform and Restructuring Mean for Culturally Diverse Exceptional Learners?" (Festus E. Obiakor and Cheryl Utley); and (7) "Forging Partnerships in Special Education To Enhance Collaboration between Mexico and the United States" (Todd Fletcher and others). (Each paper contains references.) (CR)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 424 714

COMPENDIUM: WRITINGS ON EFFECTIVE PRACTICES FOR CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE EXCEPTIONAL LEARNERS

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Editor
Bridgie Alexis Ford, Ph.D.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
J. Greer
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
1

DDEL

A Publication of the Division for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Exceptional Learners (DDEL)
The Council for Exceptional Children

EC 306819

COMPENDIUM: WRITINGS ON EFFECTIVE PRACTICES FOR CULTURALLY AND LINGUISTICALLY DIVERSE EXCEPTIONAL LEARNERS

Editor:

Bridgie Alexis Ford, Ph.D
The University of Akron

A Publication of the Division for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Exceptional Learners (DDEL)
The Council for Exceptional Children
Reston, Virginia

1998

CONTENTS

Preface
Bridgie Alexis Ford

1. Parent-Involved Social Skill Instruction and the Perceptions of Children At Risk and Children with Normal Achievement and Development

Brenda L. Townsend and Richard L. Simpson

20. Participatory Action Research Involving Families from Underserved Communities and Researchers: Respecting Cultural and Linguistic Diversity

Ursula Markey, Betsy Santelli, and Ann P. Turnbull

34. Promoting Inclusion through Exito: An Integrated Assessment and Instruction Professional Development Model

J.S. de Valenzuela, Leonard Baca, and Candace Clark

47. Intervention Strategies for CLD Students with Speech-Language Disorders

Li-Rong Lilly Cheng

57. A Study of Effective Instructional Practices by Monolingual English-Speaking and Bilingual/Bicultural Teachers in Five Programs Serving Hispanic Preschoolers with Developmental Disabilities

Jozi De Leon and Laurie L. McCarty

88. What Do Reform and Restructuring Mean for Culturally Diverse Exceptional Learners?

Festus E. Obiakor and Cheryl Utley

99. Forging Partnerships in Special Education to Enhance Collaboration Between Mexico and the United States

Todd Fletcher, Candace Bos, Sandra Engoron, and Jean Favela

Preface

Bridgie Alexis Ford, Editor

As we prepare to enter the next millennium, the delivery of effective educational services for youth from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds with disabilities and/or gifts and talents remain a major issue. Given the projected increase in the number of school age youth from culturally and linguistically diverse groups, there must be serious attention to policies, research, and educational practices that impede maximum learning. To this end, the compendium of writings within this special publication by the Division for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Exceptional Learners (DDEL) will serve as an invaluable resource tool for special educators, general educators, administrators, and other school personnel. In addition, the compilation and dissemination of this unique compendium of writings are in response to requests from DDEL members and other professionals for authentic, quality information about effective research and educational practices for culturally and linguistically diverse exceptional learners. This Compendium is a result of two national Multicultural Symposia sponsored by DDEL and the Council for Exceptional Children.

This Compendium focuses on an array of timely topics that combine research and educational practices. Congruent with DDEL's mission and DDEL's refereed publication, *Multiple Voices for Ethnically Diverse Exceptional Learners (Multiple Voices)*, the Compendium addresses innovative issues critical to effective pedagogy and research. A publication of this nature requires the vision, commitment, and energy of numerous persons. On behalf of DDEL, I congratulate the contributors to this Compendium and thank the associate editors and Editorial Board members of *Multiple Voices* for their perseverance in bringing this project to fruition. Additionally, I thank the DDEL Executive Committee for their unflinching support in this worthy project.

Parent-Involved Social Skill Instruction and the Perceptions of Children At Risk and Children with Normal Achievement and Development

Brenda L. Townsend, Ph.D., University of South Florida
Richard L. Simpson, Ed.D., University of Kansas

Abstract

This study describes the participation of parents in a leadership and social skill instruction program for elementary-age children identified by their teachers as at-risk for school failure or as normally developing and achieving. Initially, the children considered at risk were perceived by parents, teachers and peers as having less favorable social competence than their normally developing and achieving peers. However, following the 14-week parent-involved social skill instruction program, these students were perceived as having made significant social gains. Moreover, their post-intervention social skills were perceived as being similar to their normally developing and achieving peers. Results of these data are discussed relative to social skill training programs, and specifically the need for parent involvement in these activities.

A number of researchers have focused on analyzing and understanding the social skills and deficits of students who are at risk and those with identified mild disabilities (e.g., learning disabilities and attention deficit-hyperactive disorder) (Coleman, Meham, & Minnett, 1992). A consistent finding emerging from this work has been that students at risk of school failure and dropping out of school, along with students with disabilities, tend to have less well developed social skills and to be less socially accepted than their normally developing and achieving peers (Cartledge & Milburn, 1978; Fox, 1989; Pianta, 1990; Shores, 1987; Strain & Shores, 1977).

Indeed, there is evidence that social skill deficits are a defining and consistent characteristic of at-risk students, thus making them a common concern for both professionals and parents (Bursuck, 1989; Forness & Kavale, 1993; Vaughn, Zaragoza, Hogan & Walker, 1993). Thus, it is not surprising that extensive time and effort has been devoted to identifying efficient and utilitarian intervention options for children who lack effective social skills (Brendtro, Brokenleg, & Bockern, 1990; Fox & Savelle, 1987; Maag, 1989; McIntosh, Vaughn, & Zaragoza, 1991; Odom, McConnell, &

McEvoy, 1992). Such pursuits seem particularly timely given the current emphasis on placing and supporting students at risk and those with identified disabilities in general education settings (Stainback & Stainback, 1992; U.S. Department of Education, 1993).

Need for Parent-Involvement in Social Skill Instruction

When students are at risk, their academic growth does not suffer alone. For many of these students, inept social skills also inhibit their development. Social skills, as defined by Libet and Lewhinson (1973) are displayed when students produce behaviors that others reinforce, and inhibit behaviors that others are apt to extinguish or punish. Research efforts with children at risk have typically addressed academic interventions. In an extensive review of effective instructional programs with students who are at risk, Slavin, Karweit, and Madden (1989) extolled programs with goals to facilitate academic goals—reading, math, or language development. Hence, it appeared that interventions emphasizing academic goals are considered most successful with students who are at risk.

With academic goals as the focal point, students at risk, and without identified exceptionalities, have received minimal social development instruction (Cooper & Speece, 1990; Larson, 1989). Despite a lack of social competence, they do not regularly receive social skill instruction. Traditionally, students with exceptionalities have been targeted and benefited from social skill instruction (e.g., Bandura, 1977; Bryan, 1982; Fox, 1989; LaGreca & Messibov, 1981; Sandler, Arnold, Gable, & Strain, 1987). There is a paucity of research on social skill instruction with children who are at risk (Foulks & Morrow, 1989; Larson, 1989). Hence, being at risk does not ensure that students will receive social skill instruction in school settings.

Social skill instructional approaches for children with exceptionalities have evolved from child-centered approaches, focusing on the target student's deficits, to mediated ones, involving persons with whom target students interact. Criticisms of traditional child-centered approaches have given rise to more recent peer-mediated interventions. Strain and his colleagues (1984) noted that child-centered interventions falsely assume that children lack social skills when those skills are not demonstrated and negate the impact of environmental factors on behaviors. Moreover, peer-mediated approaches have been reported to maximize "entrapment" (McConnell, 1987). According to McConnell, peer behaviors naturally reinforce target student use of newly acquired social behaviors.

Target children's peers have been employed in various roles to mediate the social skill acquisition process. When peers were trained a, student peer facilitators with children who were socially withdrawn, the children who were neglected were accepted more favorably (Middleton, Zollinger, & Keene, 1986). Fox (1989) paired children with learning disabilities who were socially rejected with their peers who did not have learning disabili-

ties. In comparison with students paired on academic tasks, the students paired according to mutual interests maintained more favorable ratings of each other subsequent to the intervention.

Peer confrontation procedures have been used to decrease disruptive behaviors (Sandler et al., 1987). In that investigation, peers exerted and maintained influence over the target students after the peer confrontation procedures were no longer employed. It has been clearly demonstrated that social skill instructional activities can be structured to promote positive social interaction among students with behavioral difficulties. While peer-mediated interventions hold promise in social skill instruction, other individuals who play significant roles in target students' lives should not be overlooked as viable participants in their social skill instruction (Budd & Itzkowitz, 1990).

A specific consistent and enduring concern regarding social skill interventions has been the identification of strategies that ensure effective maintenance, transfer, and generalization of skills. Maintenance of social skills over time, and generalization of social skills across settings requires the use of vanous generalization measures (Sainato, 1990). In that regard, authorities have noted the need to plan for skill maintenance and generalization across settings, times and persons (McConnell, 1987; Misra, 1992; Sargent, 1991; Simpson, 1987). Accordingly, reinforcement and maintenance of students' social skills taught at school, and transfer of students' social skills to home and community settings through involvement of parents in school-based social skill training programs has long been advocated (Gresham, 1981; Stokes & Baer, 1977). However, only limited work has been done in this area, particularly with students identified as being at-risk for educational failure (Budd & Itzkowitz, 1990).

While more recent social skill instruction approaches have acknowledged the power of the peer group in effecting social behavior changes, interventions typically do not actively involve children's parents. Parent roles in social skill instruction have often been peripheral to children's instruction (e.g., Blackmore, Rich, Means, & Nally, 1976). In response to this issue, several researchers established a program wherein parents provided their children with contingencies in home settings based on reports of their behaviors in school settings (Blackmore et al., 1976; Edlund, 1969).

In a related study, Budd and Itzkowitz (1990) found that parent training enhanced parents' social skill knowledge and improved their perceptions of their children's social competence following the intervention. Indeed, not only have parents delivered contingencies in settings which differ from the ones in which the behavior occurred, but they have also been instructed separately from their children. Even marginal efforts at parent involvement in changing students' behavior have produced positive results. However, missing from the literature base on children with academic and social risks,

are investigations of simultaneous parent and child involvement in social skill instruction.

Thus, the purpose of the present study was to investigate the effects of parent-involved and supported leadership and social skill instruction on the perceptions of elementary-age students who were at-risk for school failure and students who were achieving and developing normally.

Method

Subjects

The subjects were 15 general education students enrolled in 4th, 5th, and 6th grades. Although none of the students had been identified as having an exceptionality, six students were teacher-identified as at risk for school failure, and 9 students were teacheridentified as normally-achieving and developing. The students at risk included 2 fourth graders, 3 fifth graders, and 1 enrolled in sixth grade (5 males and 1 female). Of the students with normal achievement and development, 3 were fourth graders, 4 were fifth graders, and 2 were sixth graders (6 females and 3 males). The at-risk group (AR) was composed of 2 white students, 2 black students, and 2 Hispanic students. The normally-achieving and developing group (NAAD) was comprised of 7 white students and 2 black students.

The teacher nomination process involved having six 4th, 5th, and 6th grade teachers each nominate 5 students they considered at risk for academic and social failure; they also nominated 5 students they perceived to be normally-achieving and developing. Thus, two pools of potential subjects were created: 30 AR students and 30 NAAD students.

Subsequent to the identification of the initial subject pool, the parents of the 60 students were invited to attend an informational seminar in which the parent-involved social skill enhancement program was introduced. Of those parents attending the seminar, 19 agreed to participate in the study. Six students at risk and nine students achieving and developing normally completed the entire social skill program with their parents.

The midwestern, suburban city in which the school district is located has a population of 26,000. Twenty-four percent of the residents are ethnic minority group members and 76% are members of the dominant culture group. The school district, which serves approximately 4,600 students, is comprised of six elementary schools, 2 junior highs, and 1 senior high school. The elementary school at which the study was undertaken has a student population of 502, of which 30% are members of ethnic minority groups. Twenty-four percent of the students qualified for free or reduced lunches.

Procedure

Instruments

The Walker-McConnell Scale of Social Competence and School Adjustment (W-M) (Walker & McConnell, 1988) was used to access teacher

perceptions of students' social competence on (a) teacher-preferred social skills, (b) peer-preferred social skills, and, (c) school adjustment behaviors. The W-M was administered one week prior to implementation of the parent-involved social skill training intervention and again one week following the last social skill training session. The W-M is a 43 item teacher rating scale designed to identify elementary children's social skill deficits. A 5 point Likert scale ranging from 1 (never) to 5 (always) is used to indicate the extent to which statements (e.g., "makes friends easily with other people") are characteristic of the student.

The Behavior Rating Profile. (BRP) (Brown & Hammill, 1983) is designed to identify students perceived as having behavior difficulties and the settings in which maladaptive behaviors prominently appear. It consists of independent, individually normed measures: The Parent Rating Scale, The Teacher Rating Scale, and a sociometric instrument. Scaled scores facilitate comparisons across subtests.

The Parent Rating Scale of the BRP was used to reflect parent perceptions of their children's social behaviors. It is a 30 item checklist allowing parents to rate their children on the extent to which statements are characteristic of their children, using a 4 point Likert scale. *The Student Rating Scale* of the BRP is a 60 item checklist to which students respond "true" or "false" to various items relating to school situations, home situations, and peer relationships. *The Behavior Rating Profile Sociogram* is a peer-nominating procedure in which target students and their classmates are asked to identify 3 students in their classroom whom they perceive most positively and 3 students whom they perceive most negatively in interpersonal relationships. For the purpose of the present study, the following 2 pairs of questions were selected to obtain student responses:

1a. Which of the students in your class would you most like to have as your friend?
1b. Which of the students in your class would you least like to have as your friend?
2a. Which of the students in your class would you most like to sit with at lunch?
2b. Which of the students in your class would you least like to sit with at lunch?

The BRP was administered the week prior to implementation of the social 1 skill intervention and the week following the last instructional session.

Parent-Involved Social Skill Instruction Program

The intervention consisted of a 14 week parent-involved social skill enhancement program with 6 students who were at-risk and their parents and 9 students who were achieving and developing normally and their parents. The first session consisted of the participants engaging in outdoors

activities to promote group cooperation and team-building skills. Subsequent to this initial contact, twelve sessions simultaneously involved the parents and children in facilitated social skill enhancement. During the 14th session, the students and their parents formed teams and played a social skill game, "Born Leader," during which time they applied the skills acquired throughout the 14-week social skill enhancement program. A masters level certified special education teacher, who was a teacher of children with behavior disorders in a different school district, facilitated the weekly, 1 hour instructional sessions in the elementary school's multipurpose room. All sessions were held on an evening that was mutually agreed upon by participating parents and children.

Parent and Child Training Strategies (PACTS). Due to the unavailability of commercial social skill training packages which concurrently involved parents and children in a social skill instruction, a curriculum was developed for this study. The curriculum, *Parent and Child Training Strategies* (PACTS) (Walker, 1991) is a 13-week leadership and social skill enhancement curriculum specifically designed to actively involve parents in the enhancement of their children's social skills. Instructional activities are structured to facilitate students learning prosocial skills, while providing parents with role-specific instruction on mediating their children's social skill acquisition. Twelve leadership and social skills are included in the PACTS curriculum: Listening, following instructions, introducing self to others, offering help, complimenting others, apologizing, accepting "no," saying "no," responding to teasing, problem-solving, persuading others, and negotiating. A parent-child dyad and whole group reinforcement system is incorporated in PACTS. Thus, parent-child dyads earned tokens ("Born Leader" cards) during each session. At the close of each session, the cards were tallied and recorded. Each dyad earned and accumulated cards toward a group pizza party.

A multifaceted method was used to establish the social validity of the PACTS curriculum (i.e., the importance individuals attach to learning particular skills) (Baer, Wolf, & Risley, 1968)). Specifically, several commercially available social skill training programs were reviewed to determine (a) skills targeted for instruction, (b) instructional techniques used for skill acquisition, and (c) the number of skill steps or tasks required for successfully performing the targeted social skill. Several social skill programs were reviewed and the 12 most frequently taught skills were identified for inclusion in PACTS.

In addition, feedback was solicited from the participating students and their parents on the social skills they wanted to acquire and the order in which they preferred that the skills be taught. Thus, activities commonly used to instruct students on social skills were adapted to accommodate parent-child dyads and parent preferences. Several commonly employed

social skill practices were incorporated in PACTS (i.e., role-playing, modeling, coaching, behavior rehearsing). However, a unique component of the PACTS curriculum was the simultaneous training of parents and children. Hence, strategies were developed to provide parents with models and opportunities for evaluating, modeling, and reinforcing select prosocial skills. Moreover, the requisite steps for performing the target social skills were reduced to the minimum number possible.

Social skill instruction format. The instructional plan for each of the 12 Social skills followed a common format. That structure included incorporations of each of the nine elements identified below.

a. **Previous skill review. A brief review of the** previously taught social skill was provided at the beginning of sessions 2-14.
b. **Attention grabber.** A story format was used to provide rationales for the participants learning the various skills as elements of each session were modeled.
c. **Modeling**. Social skills were modeled by the facilitator and participants as an instructional component of each session.
d. **Practice opportunities.** Scenarios generated by the facilitator and participating students, and parents were used for in- session and home social skill instruction practice.
e. **Verbal mediation.** Students were instructed to talk themselves through skills and parents were taught to verbally coach their children on particular skills.
f. **Independent practice.** Students were given 3 opportunities to demonstrate a skill unassisted, during which time their parents completed an evaluation checklist.
g. **Evaluation.** Parents and children evaluated and discussed each child's progress during each phase of social skill instruction.
h. **Performance feedback.** The facilitator provided students and their parents with feedback and encouragement.
i. **Transfer of training.** In home or community settings, students performed each social skill a minimum of three times during the week it was initially introduced.

Facilitator training and fidelity of implementation. The intervention was facilitated by a certified, masters level teacher of children with behavior disorders. The facilitator received 4 hours of training on the use of the PACTS curriculum and was observed on 3 occasions to provide assurance that she was adhering to each lesson plan component, as specified in the PACTS curriculum.

Experimental Design

The study employed a pre-posttest design to compare the effects of parent-involved social skill instruction with AR children with those of par-

ent-involved social skill instruction of NAAD children. Teachers, parents, and students independently evaluated the participating students on social behaviors. These evaluations composed the baseline and post-intervention data.

Results

Not surprisingly, W-M pretest ratings revealed that teachers and peers perceived AR subjects to have poorer social skills and behaviors than students in the NAAD group. The categories and group means were: Teacher-preferred (AR = 40.80, NAAD = 59.75), peer-preferred (AR = 50.00, NAAD = 65.00, School adjustment (AR = 26.80, NAAD = 42.50), and Total score (AR = 1 17.60, NAAD = 167.25). A multivariate analysis of covariance, with the pretest score as the covariate, was used to distinguish group differences on the three categories after the intervention. As shown in Table 1, no significant differences were found between the two groups (Wilks Exact F (3,16) = 1.041, *p >.05)*. An analysis of covariance on the total score also revealed no significant differences between the two groups of students (F(1) = .02, p>.05).

Table 1
Observed and Adiusted Posttest Means for Teacher-Ratings

	Teacher-Preferred Behaviors		Peer-Preferred Behaviors		School Adjustment		Total	
	Observed Mean	Adjusted Mean	Observed Mean	Adjusted Mean	Observed Mean	Adjusted Mean	Observed Mean	Adjusted Mean
At-Risk	43.00	50.53	50.60	57.62	29.40	37.72	123.00	142.07
Normally Achieving and Developing	56.25	48.71	62.87	55.84	40.00	31.67	159.12	140.05

The Parent Rating Scale of the BRP was used to reflect parent perceptions of their children's behavior. Table 2 shows that observable differences existed between the two groups on the pretest means (AR = 47.20, SD = 14.55, NAAD = 60.12, SD = 12.82). An analysis of covariance of the posttest parent ratings, however, indicated no significant differences between the children who were at-risk and those who were achieving and developing normally.

Table 2
Means, Standard Deviations, and Ranges of Parent Rating Pre- and Posttest

	At-Risk				Normally Achieving and Developing			
	M	SD	R	n	M	SD	R	n
Pretest	47.20	14.55	33	6	60.12	12.82	38	9
Posttest	65.60	14.75	32	5	70.87	12.20	34	8

Analysis of Covariance of Posttest Parent Ratings

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Group	2.80	1	2.80	.02	>.05
Within Cells	1434.80	10	143.48		

Pretest results of *The Student Rating Scale* of the BRP (shown in Table 3) revealed that the AR children were rated lower on the three subseales than their normally-achieving and developing peers. However, a multivariate analysis of covariance on the scores following the intervention program revealed that differences between the two groups' scores reached statistical significance on the school category only. Thus, while the children who were at risk rated themselves less favorably than their normally-achieving and developing peers on each of the categories, the differences were significant for school related behaviors only.

Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations, Ranges, and t- values for Student Rating Scale Pretests

	At-Risk (n = 6)			Normally Achieving and Developing (n = 9)					
Subscale	M	SD	R	M	SD	R	t	df	p
Home	12.50	4.97	12	15.33	3.60	11	-1.20	8.47	>.05
School	9.50	5.28	14	14.55	5.10	11	-1.84	10.59	>.05
Peer	10.83	5.49	14	14.88	3.37	14	-1.62	7.53	>.05

Means and F Ratios of Student Rating Posttest

	At-Risk (n = 6)		Normally Achieving and Developing (n = 9)			
Subscale	Obseved Mean	Adjusted Mean	Observed Mean	Adjusted Mean		
Home	11.66	13.13	14.44	12.97	.0128	>.05
School	8.33	10.02	15.00	13.31	8.2600	<.05
Peer	12.83	14.53	14.33	12.63	.9710	>.05

The Behavior Rating Profile Sociogram was used to indicate students' social class rankings. As shown in Table 4, the pretest, mean and standard deviation for the AR group was 8.83 and 2.78, respectively; and 10.33 and 2.64, respectively, for the NAAD group. However, considerable class ranking gains were shown by several of the students following the instructional program. Observed and adjusted means of class rankings are reported in Table 5 along with analysis of covariance results. The differences did not reach statistical significance.

Table 4

Individual Class Rankings, Standard Scores, and Group Means

	Pretest		Posttest	
At-Risk Student (n = 6)	Class Ranking	Standard Score	Class Ranking	Standard Score
1	16.5/22	8	6.7/22	12
2	7.5/22	12	8.5/22	11
3	15/24	9	10/24	11
4	24/24	4	24/24	4
5	8.5/24	11	12/24	10
6	17.5/25	9	12/25	10
(M) 8.83				
(SD) 2.78				
(R) 8.00				
Normally Achieving and Developing (n = 9)				
1	7.5/22	12	5.5/22	13
2	9.5/22	11	12.5/22	10
3	5.5/22	13	12.5/22	10
4	20.5/24	7	18.5/24	8
5	8/24	11	7.5/24	12
6	15/24	9	10/24	11
7	22/24	6	10/24	11
8	3/26	14	5/26	13
9	13.5/25	10	6.5/25	12
(M) 10.33				
(SD) 2.64				
(R) 8.00				

Note. Class ranking = rank among total number of students in class.

Discussion

Several measures were used to reflect various individual social competence perceptions of students at risk and students achieving and developing normally. In this regard, results of the study showed that after the parent-involved intervention, perceptions of children considered to be at risk for school failure approximated those of their normally-achieving and developing peers. Thus, subsequent to parent-involved instruction, statistically significant teacher perception, parent perception, or social ranking differences were generally no longer observed between the two groups. These data lead to the undeniable conclusion that the parent involved social skill instruction was associated with significant perceived social and behavioral improvement for AR students, to the extent that they were reviewed in a similar fashion to their normally developing and achieving peers, who also showed improvement. Significant differences between AR and NAAD students were revealed on the school-related behaviors of the student ratings scale. Specifically, the AR children rated themselves less favorably than their normally-achieving and developing peers with regard to school behavior. It is unclear why this particular setting was considered

Table 5
Observed and Odjusted Posttest Means of Class Rankings

	Observed Mean	Adjusted Mean
At-Risk (n = 6)	9.66	10.05
Normally Achieving and Developing (n = 9)	11.00	10.60

Analysis of Covariance on Glass Ranking Posttests

Source	SS	df	MS	F	p
Group	1.00	1	1.00	.32	>.05
Within Cells	37.32	12	3.11		

most problematic. One obvious interpretation, however, is that school settings may present these children with the most difficulty, and thus give rise to more severe self-ratings on school-related items. It is also possible that school social problems were somehow linked to academic or cognitive difficulties, which were more likely to be noted in school senings.

Several plausible explanations exist for similar social competence perceptions obtained on the two groups by teachers, parents and peers. The lack of significant differences between the groups on the ratings and class rankings could be attributed to mutually-shared student characteristics. Cooper and Speece (1990) suggested that comparisons of these two groups have produced serendipitous results: at-risk and normally achieving and developing students demonstrate similar academic and behavioral responses. As a result, anticipated dramatic differences between them are not apparent. In this study, involving parents in children's social skill enhancement instruction may have further muted AR and NAAD group differences.

Another explanation involves the concurrent instruction of the students at risk and those achieving and developing normally. During the social skill sessions, the children had multiple opportunities to observe and imitate their peers' behavioral responses. Thus, modeling effects (Bandura, 1977) resulting from parallel social skill instruction received by the two groups could account for similar behaviors, and thus, similar perceptions. Additional research is needed to explore the influence of this variable in social skill acquisition.

While there were no significant differences on the parent rating scale responses subsequent to the intervention, improved parent ratings from pre to posttest occasions were observed for 80% of the AR students and 75% of the NAAD students. Parents may have actually observed their children using the social skills in other settings and thus, reflected their observations in their ratings. Since both groups showed improvement, a differential effect might have occurred as the AR group improved more than their peers, and thus appeared more similar to NAAD students.

Slight improvements in social status were observed from pre to posttest occasions for both the AR and NAAD groups, though no significant differences were observed. The brevity of a 14 week intervention may be suspect in facilitating even marginal improvement in social status. A longer intervention period may be required to substantially affect social status. Coie and Dodge (1983) reported that rejected children's social status appears fixed even when their peers and schools have changed. This is consistent with research findings that the social status of unpopular children remained unchanged following social skill instruction, even though the number of social initiations made by the students increased (LaGreca & Santogrossi, 1980). Other researchers have reported that social skill train-

ing with unpopular children can effect changes in social status (Coie & Krehbiel, 1984; Ladd, 1981; Oden & Asher, 1977). Clearly, longitudinal research is needed to document those elements of intervention packages (i.e., duration and training components) that facilitate favorable changes in social status.

Several limitations are suffered in the current study. The sample of 15 students was drawn from one midwestern elementary school with 24% of its children eligible for its federally-subsidized lunch program. It is unknown whether the present findings typify students of larger samples or who vary along other demographics.

The PACTS curriculum, used in the current study, was developed as a training package, as it incorporated several well-known social skill training practices (i.e., modeling, coaching, role-playing). Nonetheless, a criticism of using social skill training packages is that it is difficult to determine which components, either singly or in combination, produce the greatest effects (Gresham, 1981).

The students' teachers, as well as their parents, were aware that the students were receiving parent-involved social skill instruction. That awareness may have influenced their expectations of the students' behaviors and biased their post-intervention ratings. Generalization and maintenance issues continue to plaque social skill training efforts (Sasso, Melloy, & Kavale, 1990; Schloss, Schloss, Wood, & Kiehl, 1986). Studies are needed to obtain perceptions of others who play significant roles in students' lives. That is, the effects of parent involved social skill instruction should also be assessed by non-participating family members and additional school personnel.

Parent involvement in their children's behavioral change programs have typically been peripheral to their children's social skill instruction (i.e., Blackmore et al., 1976; Rogers & Kramer, 1988). No studies were located which provided simultaneous social skill enhancement for students and role-specific instruction for parents. When compared to investigations of parent involvement, albeit separate from student instruction, the current findings also indicate the power of parents in effecting behavioral change (i.e., Budd & Itzkowitz, 1990). It appears that perceptions of students who were at-risk approximated their normally-achieving peers when their parents were actively involved in social skill enhancement.

In addition to the similarities observed in perceptions of the children who were AR and NAAD after the intervention, anecdotal data were collected from the students' significant others. Unsolicited positive comments were reported by parents, students, administrators, teachers, and peers. Parents frequently reported voluntarily using the social skill enhancement strategies with the participating students' siblings. The students often expressed their satisfaction with the intervention and seemed most enthused

that their parents were learning simultaneously. Administrators commented about the use of "conflict resolution" language that participating students were overheard using, (e.g., "let's see if we can agree on the problem"). Nonparticipating students often inquired about opportunities to enroll and participate in the parent-involved social skill program. While this study showed that parent-involved social instruction is a promising practice in skill acquisition for students who are at risk for school failure, further studies are needed to asses the effects of parent-involved social skill instruction on children with identified behavior or learning disabilities.

References

Alderman, M. K. (1990). Motivation for at risk students. *Educational Leadership, 48*(1), 27-30.

Almanza, H. P. & Mosley, W. J. (1980). Curriculum adaptations and modifications for culturally diverse handicapped children. *Exceptional Children, 46*(8), 608-614.

Baer, D. M., Wolf, M., & Risley, T. R. (1968). Some current dimensions of applied behavior analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1*, 91-97.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Blackmore, M., Rich, N., Means, Z., & Nally, M. (1976). Summer therapeutic environment program-STEP: A hospital alternative for children. In E. Mash, L. H. Jamerlynck, & L. Handy (Eds.), *Behavior modification approaches to parenting*. New York: Bruner-Mazel.

Brendtro, L.K., Brokenleg, M., & Bockern, S.V. (1990). *Reclaiming youth at risk*. Bloomington, IN: National Educational Service.

Brown, L. L., & Hammill, D. D. (1983). *Behavior Rating Profile*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Bryan, T. (1982). Social skills of learning disabled children and youth: An overview. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 5*, 332-333.

Budd, K.S., & Itzkowitz, J.S. (1990). Parents as social skill trainers and evaluators of children. *Child and Family Behavior Therapy, 12*(3), 13-29.

Bursuck, W. (1989). A comparison of students with learning disabilities to low achieving and high achieving students on three dimensions of social competence. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 22*, 188-194.

Carbo, M., & Hodges, H. (1988). Learning stylPs strategies can help students at risk. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 20*(4), 55-58.

Cartledge, G., & Milburn, J. F. (1978). The case for teaching social skills in the classroom: A review. *Review of Educational Research, 1*, 133-156.

Coie, J. D., & Dodge, K. A. (1983). Continuities and changes in children's social status: A five year study. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 29*, 261-262.

Coie, J. D., & Krehbiel, G. (1984). Effects of academic tutoring of the social status of low-achieving, socially rejected children. *Child Development, 55*, 1465-1478.

Coleman, J.M., Meham, L.A., & Minnett, A.M. (1992). Similarities in the social competencies of learning disabled and low achieving elementary school children. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 25*(10), 671-677.

Comer, J. P. (1987). New Haven's school community connection. *Educational Leadership, 44*(6), 13-16.

Conrath, J. (1988). A new deal for at-risk students. *National Association for Secondary School Principals Bulletin, 72*(504), 3640.

Cooper, D. H., & Speece, D. L. (1990). Instructional correlates of students' academic responses: Comparisons between at-risk and control students. *Early Education & Development, 1*(4), 279-299.

Eckstron, R. B., Goertz, M. E., Pollack, J. M., & Rock, D. A. (1986). Who drops out of high school and why? Findings from a national study. *Teachers College Record, 87*(3), 356-373.

Edgar, E. (1987). Secondary programs in special education: Are many of them justifiable? *Exceptional Children 53*, 555-561.

Edlund, C. (1969). Rewards at home to promote desirable school behavior. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 1*(4), 121 - 127.

Forness, S., & Kavale, K. (1993). Social skills deficits as primary learning disabilities: A note on problems with the ICLD diagnostic criteria. *Learning Disabilities Research and Practice, 6*, 44-49.

Foulks, B., & Morrow, R. D. (1989). Academic survival skills for the young child at risk for school failure. *Journal of Educational Research, 82*(3), 158-165.

Fox, C. L. (1989). Peer acceptance of learning disabled children in the regular classroom. *Exceptional Children, 56*(1), 50-59.

Fox, J., & Savelle, S. (1987). Social interaction research and families of behaviorally disordered children: A critical review and forward look. *Behavioral Disorders, 12*(4), 276-291.

Frisby, C. L., Heflin, L. J., Altman, R., Shaw, S. F., Colliert, C., Elliott, R., Ochsner, G. J., & Fleischner, J. (1991). Innovative practices for meeting the needs of students who are at-risk. In L. M. Bullock & R. L. Simpson (Eds.), *Monograph on critical issues in special education: Implications for personnel preparation* (pp.111-123). Denton, TX: University of North Texas.

Gajewski, N., & Mayo, P. (1989). *SSS: Social skill strategies* (Books A & B). Eau Claire, WI: Thinking Publications.

Greene, B., & Uroff, S. (1989). Apollo high school: Achievement through self-esteem. *Educational Leadership, 46*(5), 80-81.

Gresham, F.M. (1981). Social skills training with handicapped children: Review. *Review of Educational Research, 51*, 139-176.

Hazel, J. S., Schumaker, J. B., Sheran, J. A., & Wildgen, J. (1981). *Asset: A social skills program for adolescents*. Champaign, IL: Normal Baxley & Associates and Research Press.

Hess, F. (1987). *A comprehensive analysis of the dropout phenomenon in an urban school system*. Paper prepared for American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Kretovics, J., & Nussel, E. J. (Eds.). (1994). *Transforming urban education*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

LaGreca, A. M., & Messibov, G. (1981). Facilitating interpersonal functioning with peers of learning disabled children. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 14*, 197-199.

LaGreca, A. M., & Santogrossi, D. A. (1980). Social skills training with elementary school students: A behavioral group approach. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 48*, 220-226.

Larson, K. A. (1989). Task-related and interpersonal problem-solving training for increasing school success in high-risk young adolescents. *Remedial and Special Education, 10*(5), 32-42.

Libet, J. M., & Lewinsohn, P. M. (1973). Concept of social skills with special reference to the behavior of depressed persons. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 40*, 304-312.

Maag, J.W. (1989). Assessment in social skills training: Methodological and conceptual issues for research and practice. *Remedial and Special Education, 10*(4), 6-17.

McConnell, S. R. (1987). Entrapment effects and the generalization and maintenance of social shills training for elementary school students with behavioral disorders. *Behavioral Disorders, 12* 252-263.

McGinnis, E., & Goldstein, A. P. (1984). *Skillstreaming the elementary school child*. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

McIntosh, R., Vaughn, S., & Zaragoza, N. (1991). A review of social interventions for students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 24*(8), 451-458.

Middleton, H., Zollinger, J., & Keene, R. (1986). Popular peers as change agents for the socially neglected child in the classroom. *Journal of School Psychology, 24*, 343-350.

Misra, A. (1992). Generalization of social skills through self-monitoring by adults with mild mental retardation. *Exceptional Children, 58*, 495-507.

Oden, S., & Asher, F. R. (1977). Coaching children in social skills for friendship making. *Child Development, 48*, 495-506.

Odom, S.L., McConnell, S.R., & McEvoy, M.A. (1992). Social competence of students with learning disabilities. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 26*, 404-412.

Payne, B. D., & Payne, D. A. (1989). Sex, race, and grade differences in the locus of oontrol orientations of at-risk elementary students. *Psychology in the Schools, 26*, 84-88

Pellicano, R. R. (1987). At risk: A view of social advantage. *Educational Leadership, 44*, 47-49.

Pianta, R. C. (1990). Widening the debate on educational reform: Prevention as a viable alternative. *Exceptional Children 56*, 306-313.

Reynolds, M. C., & Walberg, H. C., & Walberg, H. J. (1987). The necessary restructuring of special and regular education. *Exceptional Children, 53*, 391-398.

Roger, R., & Kramer, J. J. (1988). Parent training research: An analysis of the empirical literature 1975-1985. *Psychology in the Schools, 25*, 325-330.

Sainato, D. (1990). Classroom transitions: Organizing environments to promote independent performance in preschool children with disabilities. *Education and Treatment of Children, 13*, 288-297.

Sandler, A. G., Arnold, L. B., Gable, R. A., & Strain, P. S. (1987). Effects of peer pressure on disruptive behavior of behaviorally disordered classmates, *Behavioral Disorders, 12*, 104-110.

Sargent, L.R. (1991). *Social skills for school and community*. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Sasso, G. M., Melloy, K. J., & Kavale, K. A. (1990). Generalization, maintenance, and behavioral covariation associated with social skills training through structured learning. *Behavioral Disorders, 16*, 9-22.

Schloss, P. J., Schloss, C. N., Wood, C. E., & Kiehl, W. S. (1986). A critical review of social skills research with behaviorally disordered students. *Behavioral Disorders, 12*, 1-14.

Schumaker, J. B., Hazel, J. S., & Pederson, C. S. (1988). *Social skills for daily living: A curriculum*. Circle Pines, MN: American Guidance Services.

Shores, R.E. (1987). Overview of research on social interaction: A historical and personal perspective. *Behavioral Disorders, 12*, 233-241.

Simpson, R. (1987). Social interactions of behaviorally disordered children and youth: Where are we are where do we need to go? *Behavioral Disorders, 12*, 292-298.

Slavin, R. E., & Madden, N. A. (1989). What works for students at risk: A research synthesis. *Educational Leadership, 46*, 4-13.

Slavin, R. E., Karweit, N. L., & Madden, N. A. (Eds.). (1989). *Effective programs for students at risk*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Smith, R. C., & Lincoln, C. A. (1988). *America's shame, America's hope: Twelve million youth at risk*. (Unpublished report). DC, Inc.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1992). *Controversial issues confrontin2 special education*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Stokes, T. F., & Baer, D. W. (1977). An implicit technology of generalization.

Strain, P., Odom, S., & McConnell, S. (1984). Promoting social reciprocity of exceptional children: Identification, target behavior selection, and intervention. *Remedial and Special Education, 5*, 21-28.

Strain, P.S., & Shores, R.E. (1977). Social reciprocity: A review of research and educational implications. *Exceptional Children, 43*, 526-530.

Participatory Action Research Involving Families from Underserved Communities and Researchers: Respecting Cultural and Linguistic Diversity

Ursula Markey, M.A., Pyramid Parent Training Project
Betsy Santelli, M.A., and Ann P. Turnbull, Ed.D., The University of Kansas

Participatory Action Research (PAR)—a method of conducting research that involves researchers and the constituencies of the research as equal partners in all phases of the research— requires an understanding and respect for the unique perspectives and resources that each PAR team member brings to the effort. PAR can be particularly challenging when it involves a research institution from the mainstream academic culture and culturally and linguistically diverse families and students with disabilities from underserved communities. In this paper, we (a) provide an overview of participatory action research; (b) provide a contextual analysis of cultural and linguistic issues that must be addressed in research endeavors, we describe the nature of the research partnership; (d) highlight partnership challenges; and (e) highlight partnership promises.

Overview of Participatory Action Research

PAR refers to a process whereby the researchers and constituents together identify the problem to be investigated and collaborate throughout the entire data gathering, dissemination, and utilization process (Bruyère, 1993; McTaggart, 1991; Whyte, 1991). The PAR collaboration of researchers and constituents has two anticipated outcomes: (a) identifying and solving high- priority problems, and (b) ensuring that solutions are not only useful but also used by constituents. A major catalyst for PAR within the disability community is the National Institute of Disability and Rehabilitation Research, which sponsored a conference on PAR in 1989 (Turnbull &Turnbull, 1989), issued a paper several years later (Fenton, Batavia, & Roody, 1993), and sponsored a state-of-the-art conference investigating PAR procedures in 1995. NIDRR encourages researchers and constituents to "...share and utilize his or her unique skills, background, and experiences so that the common objectives of enhancing the quality of life and functioning abilities of individuals with disabilities are achieved" (Fenton, Batavia, & Roody, 1993, p. 11).

Research related to enhancing the quality of life for children and youth with disabilities can be useful to a variety of constituents—general and special educators (teachers, administrators, related services personnel), policy makers, families of students with and without disabilities, and certainly the students themselves. The majority of PAR literature within the field of special education has focused on teachers as the constituents of research (Carnine, 1997; Fuchs & Fuchs, 1990; Kauffman, Schiller, Birman, & Coutinho, 1993; Malouf & Schiller, 1994). The literature on the research-

practice gap between researchers and families has received only minimal attention in the professional literature (Parent to Parent Consortium Team, 1994; Santelli, Singer, DiVenere, Ginsburg, & Powers, 1997; Turnbull, Friesen, & Ramirez, 1995; Turnbull & Turnbull, 1993).

Contextual Analysis of Cultural and Linguistic Issues to be Addressed in Research

> I could not speak English when I arrived in the United States ten years ago, even though I had taken some English classes at the Jesuit seminary in my teens. One of my greatest problems was that the things I talk about did not happen in English; they happened in a language that has a very different mindset about reality. There is usually a significant violence done to anything being translated from one culture to another. Modern American English, which seems to me better suited for quick fixes and the thrill of a consumer culture, seems to falter when asked to communicate another person's world view. I found myself trying to ferry meanings from one language to another, and from one reality to another—a process that denaturalizes and confuses them. (Som, 1994, p. 2)

Malidoma Som's words give insight into the intimate relationship between culture and languages, and describe the difficulties inherent in researching human experiences across cultures, languages, and other modes of expression. The idea of an event happening in one languages, that cannot be captured in the words of another language suggests the multidimensional context of language and the dangers of what can be lost in translation. Some firmly believes that the failure to respect the cultural context of language is an act of violence. This violence presents the greatest challenge to the kind of communication that is essential to realizing liberty and justice for all in a multicultural society.

There are adults and children all across America who are victims of this cultural and linguistic violence. Their traditions have been slashed, their cultures dislocated, their languages broken, and their histories have been bludgeoned beyond recognition. They have been left in this condition to fend for themselves traditionally underserved communities—communities that as defined by the Report of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources are home to families of "diverse racial, cultural, and linguistic backgrounds who are isolated by geographic, social, language, cultural or racial factors" (Senate Bill 717, 1997, p. 39). These underserved urban and rural communities have been historically deprived of services because the people in them are different. Here they have been isolated behind barriers of racism, cultural discrimination, socioeconomic and geographical bias. It is a world with sparse resources—one in which many children with disabilities live and one which rarely benefits from the scientific advances that come out of research.

The schools in these communities are largely racially segregated, isolated institutions that present a microcosm of the communities that surround them. In his book *Savage Inequalities: Children in America's Schools*, Kozol (1991) described his experiences visiting children in their schools and homes in neighborhoods from Illinois to Washington, D.C., and from New York to San Antonio.

> My deepest impression...was...that these urban schools were, by and large, extraordinarily unhappy places. With few exceptions, they reminded me of "garrisons" or "outposts" in a foreign nation. Housing projects, bleak and tall, surrounded by perimeter walls lined with barbed wire, often stood adjacent to the schools I visited. Police sometimes patrolled the halls. The windows of the schools were often covered with steel grates....Looking around some of these inner-city schools...I often wondered why we would agree to let our children go to school in places where no politician, school board president, or business CEO would dream of working. (Kozol, 1991, pp. 4-5)

These are the settings where learning is taking place for thousands and thousands of children in America's schools every day. Their faces are hidden behind the statistics that depict their academic and social deficits but fail to depict the long history of racism, discrimination, and apathy that has led to these conditions. How much of children's reality has been lost in the translation by researchers who have discounted the ways these factors affect learning? Research that offers this kind of information out of context can lead to erroneous and dangerous misconceptions and generalizations about people who are culturally and linguistically diverse.

Ask most people in traditionally underserved communities about their experiences with research and you are likely to encounter a blank stare. Some may conclude that research has largely been conducted by and for the direct benefit of the majority culture. Some may remember Charles Drew, the African-American scientist who developed a method for preserving blood plasma and later, after being injured in a car accident, died when he was refused plasma. More will recall the infamous Tuskeegee incident in which African American men were left to weaken and die of treatable syphilis. Others will mention their experiences with IQ tests and other evaluations that are based on the experiences of the majority culture, English-speaking population. However, for most people in traditionally underserved communities, the world of research is a distant planet from which they receive occasional televised reports of medical breakthroughs, educational advances and brilliant new discoveries that are exciting in the first few moments before they realize that the benefits of research will most likely never reach their families.

Yet, parents of culturally diverse learners in underserved c[illegible]unities need research partners to help answer many questions. Sweet Alice Harris and the Parents of Watts want to know how to work more effectively with children who have acquired disabilities as a result of violence. Santiago Garcia and Marilyn Ruiz want to learn how to ensure continuity of special education services for children of migrant farm workers whose families must move often to follow work. Theresa Cooper and the parents of Loving Your Disabled Child in south-central Los Angeles and Nichelle Ames of Creating Opportunities for Parent Empowerment, need strategies for inclusion of children with disabilities in the mainstream that do not jeopardize their safety and progress.

In rural Pennsylvania, Gail Walker and parents involved with the Mentor Parent Program need to find ways to ensure that qualified teachers and related services are accessible to children who need them. Yvone Link, through her Parent Power program in Tacoma, is searching for ways for Korean and other Asian families to assist their children in the sometimes

difficult transition from school to work, while Lourdes Putz and Carmen Rodriguez investigate ways to get school officials to respond to the special education issues of the Spanish-speaking families served by United We Stand of New York.

D. J. Markey and Brenda Quant of Pyramid Parent Training in New Orleans want to learn more about the effects of living and learning environments on behavior, and Carol Ironrope-Herrera wants to codify her use of Lakota-Sioux traditions in teaching parents how to work with their infants and toddlers with special needs. Mr. Chu and the Vietnamese Parents with Disabled Children Association, Inc., are interested in citizenship issues surrounding their children and adult family members with disabilities, and Rose Fergusen and Agnes Johnson of Special Kids, Inc., want to learn more about adult mental health issues and their relationship to children's disabilities in homeless families. Carol Kennedy's Island Parents Educational Support and Training Center on Martha's Vineyard and Rehema Glenn's parent program in the Virgin Islands are finding ways to defeat the isolation that can result from geographical location, while Edith Sharp is hoping that their answers may apply to communities in inner-city Detroit that go unserved because of the sheer density of culturally and linguistically diverse people and the crime and violence that have come to be associated with such communities.

What are the implications of educational research for families of children with individual differences who are also from diverse cultures? How does research expand to include strategies that result in practices that translate meaningfully into their day-to-day lives? How do we move past the pain and mistrust that characterize the relationships between the research community and those who have been historically underserved due to cultural and linguistic differences? If Malidoma Some is correct, these may be impossible tasks because there is simply no way to capture what will be lost in the translation. Yet, we must find a way to accomplish this kind of communication in the America we are building. The ultimate goal of the PAR researcher working in a sophisticated university setting and the single mother raising her child with a disability in a public housing development is the same—to find the truth about what interventions can really improve the quality of life.

The Nature of the Research Partnership

In describing the nature of our PAR partnership, we first highlight the mission and resources of the Grassroots Consortium on Disabilities, followed by a description of the Beach Center on Families and Disability's mission and resources. We then briefly describe our collaborative partnership.

The Grassroots Consortium: Mission and Resources

Mission. Parents in underserved communities have never given up the struggle to get quality special education services for their children. For as long as there has been a parent movement, there have been parent leaders in these communities who have hunted for, gathered, and carried information and training in special education and disability legislation into the farthest regions of urban and rural settings. With scant community resources and virtually no outside funding, they designed and established small, community-based parent organizations in the places where they live. These community parent centers have been gathering places where par-

ents share information and lend support to each other in culturally and linguistically meaningful ways.

In 1993, fifteen of these community-based organizations came together to form the Grassroots Consortium on Disabilities. Created in the spirit of respect for each other's work, The Grassroots Consortium on Disabilities is a national, multicultural organization consisting of these 15 different community-based parent centers that, individually and collectively, focus primarily on supporting and fostering the empowerment of traditionally underserved families of children with disabilities. Its mission is to support community-based parent-run organizations that foster empowerment for families of children and young adults with disabilities in traditionally underserved communities.

Resources. Each of the member programs has had a great deal of experience, both in longevity/duration of operation and intensity of effort in working on behalf of these families. While each of the 15 model programs is unique in its supportive responses to families, program activities that are common to all include outreach, informing parents about the educational and legal rights of their children with disabilities, helping families to meet their basic needs through ongoing, often one-to-one technical assistance delivered by parents who reside in the home communities, and parent leadership in community development. The Consortium also publishes *Tapestry*, the journal of the organization—an information and dissemination resource that reports on issues having impact on families of children and youth with disabilities in diverse communities, narratives of the real-life experiences of those families in accessing special education programs and services, and strategies Consortium member organizations use in working with these families. In 1997, the Consortium was awarded a grant from the U.S. Department of Education Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (OSERS) as the first multicultural, multi-state Parent and Training Information Center, to support its work among families of children with disabilities in traditionally underserved communities.

All 15 of the Grassroots Consortium programs have been developed and are administered by parents, on a volunteer basis or a shoe-string budget, in order to provide the greatest possible personalization and responsiveness to underserved families. The 15 programs have, over the past five years alone, served over 150,000 families in traditionally underserved communities. Because the directors of the Grassroots Consortium programs have a shared history with the families served by their programs, they have an easy and comfortable access to these traditionally underserved families. What they do not have, however, is easy access to research-based information about best practices in family support that might make an immediate and beneficial difference in the lives of traditionally underserved families.

Beach Center on Families and Disability: Mission and Resources

Mission. The Beach Center is a constellation of rehabilitation research and training efforts primarily funded by the NIDRR Rehabilitation Research and Training Center program. Operating since 1988, the Beach Center has a major commitment to conduct research and training that will make significant and sustainable differences in the lives of families who have a member with a disability. Some of the topics of this research include documenting family needs related to positive behavioral support, describing successful friendships of Latino children and youth with disabilities, mea-

suring the efficacy of Parent to Parent support, constructing an instrument to measure the empowerment of families and adolescents with disabilities, and conducting policy research on family support legislation. The Beach Center also carries out a broad range of dissemination and training activities, including the preparation of research-based textbooks and other supplementary books, multimedia training packages for families, comprehensive syntheses and translations of research into practice for the benefit of families and service providers, and a comprehensive website.

Resources. The Beach Center's resources are quite similar to the resources of externally funded research institutes at universities around the country. It has access to a number of resources that enhance the efficiency of its work, such as over 30 interdisciplinary staff with advanced training, a broad computer network, an extensive library of family studies and special education books, and a broad national and international network of colleagues. These resources are enhanced by the Beach Center's collaborative relationship with the Department of Special Education and the Schiefelbusch Institute for Life Span Studies—two University of Kansas units that are extensively funded by federal and state grants and have a long history of resource acquisition.

However, as is true for most other university-based research institutes, the Beach Center has significant gaps in some resources—particularly collegial partnerships with families and educators in traditionally underserved communities. Beach Center researchers have been increasingly concerned that, in spite of extensive efforts to have a random or representative sample of families in research projects, almost invariably research samples have been drawn from the majority culture. As Beach Center staff reviewed the research literature related to families of children and youth with disabilities, they noted this same trend of having the research sample comprised primarily of white mothers (mostly middle and upper-middle class). Disturbingly, the results of this research on mostly middle and upper-middle class, white mothers is often generalized to families of all cultures and to each and every family member.

Beach Center staff have increasingly recognized that quality family support and educational practices occur within the context of culture, language, and environment. Given that many underserved families, schools, and communities continue to experience disproportionately fewer resources, Beach Center staff have been eager to establish new partnerships. Thus, when the paths of the Beach Center and the Grassroots Consortium first crossed, both organizations recognized that they shared a similar value base—a commitment to enhancing empowerment for individuals with disabilities and their families who live in underserved communities.

Collaborative Partnership

The collaborative partnership that has been forged and is continuing to develop between the Grassroots Consortium and the Beach Center brings together the unique resources of both partners and enhances the overall capacity of the partnership. With the personal and professional wisdom of members of the Grassroots Consortium on meeting the needs of underserved families affected by disability issues, the research, training, and dissemination activities conducted by the Beach Center will be more relevant and appropriate for culturally and linguistically diverse families. The professional expertise in research methodology and the national visibility of the Beach Center will mean that best practices for meeting the

needs of underserved families that are currently being implemented by the Grassroots Consortium will gain enhanced credibility among the research and service delivery communities. Our partnership will enhance the capacity of each of our organizations to fulfill our mission on behalf of all families.

Historically, partnerships between large, well-established research organizations in the dominant culture and smaller, newly developing, community-based efforts on behalf of underserved families have been beset with challenges stemming from cultural differences and priorities (Kritek, 1994). The Grassroots Consortium and the Beach Center are well aware of these potential pitfalls and recognize that we are employing a different sort of collaboration—one built on a foundation of an enhanced understanding, trust, mutual respect, and equal participation in all decision making. We also recognize that, more often than not, families believe that researchers come to an underserved community, conduct research, and leave...all without creating any direct benefits to families. We are committed to reversing that history by developing a different kind of partnership.

PAR Partnership Challenges

As is true for most new collaborative ventures, PAR brings with it new opportunities and new challenges—both for researchers and for parents in underserved communities. In the next section we discuss some of the challenges of PAR for families in underserved communities and for researchers.

PAR Challenges for Families in Underserved Communities

Development of the PAR partnership is painstakingly cautious with partners having to strike agreements on policy and procedures that do not impose added duress on already beleaguered families. One of the partnership's first challenges has been to frame it to meet both Beach Center's needs and those of the Grassroots Consortium. The process is being collaboratively designed to model values and structures that can make for successful collaborations between established and developing organizations without disempowering the latter. In the Consortium's experience, weaker, developing organizations are often enticed by the money and resources available in large powerful organizations to change their missions and long-term goals, and thus are ultimately destroyed. This is the history of these relationships.

Consortium organizations have shared experiences and developed trusting relationships with families in their communities over time. These are the bonds that allow for ongoing sharing and leadership development within communities. Given the stormy history of research and its portrayal of culturally and linguistically diverse learners in underserved communities, Consortium member organizations must be certain they will not be exposing families to the negative attitudes and biases of some researchers. If researchers introduced to families through the Consortium disrespect families, then the Consortium's credibility may be placed in jeopardy. Thus, certain procedural safeguards must be developed before researchers are introduced to families.

Leaders of Consortium member organizations also worry about the amount of time required to participate in research. Many researchers do not realize how time-consuming everyday tasks are for those who live in urban and rural communities that lack adequate transportation services,

child care, health care and emergency services. In such places, just getting to the grocery store or doing the laundry can take up most of a day. Parent leaders often provide their services and support to other parents after they fulfill their responsibilities to their own job and family. Thus, they worry that the time requirements for participation in research will be prohibitive. The challenge will be to construct realistic goals, clearly defined and designed with families, to ensure the progress of research while respecting the time constraints of the participants.

Moreover, for culturally and linguistically diverse families in underserved communities, as with most families in America, whether they are black, brown, white, red or yellow, the ultimate reality is green—money. People must have money to keep their families going. Relationships between researchers and families can become strained when researchers do not consider this very basic financial reality and do not understand the motivations of families. Consortium members always welcome the opportunity to share their experiences and information about their work and are highly motivated to do so with those sincerely interested in reaching underserved communities. They also are motivated to participate in and gain knowledge about research that is meaningful and beneficial to underserved families. However, Consortium programs operate on a shoestring budget, often out of their homes, and after regular job and family responsibilities. These circumstances often pose hardships for them in terms of time and money. Thus, they must receive compensation for their participation in research and as speakers at conferences and other events. Otherwise, researchers are asking community-based organizations to deplete their meager resources that are strictly dedicated to directly serving parents. As the research community continues to plan for the inclusion of families of diverse cultures, it must take into consideration the disparity in fiscal resources that exists between highly sophisticated research entities and developing community-based organizations, and then discuss what supports are necessary.

Additionally, from the Consortium's perspective, PAR teams will have to plan for research that will immediately and directly benefit families and communities who participate. The partners will have to collaborate on ways to bring best practices already identified in a given area of study to the community. Parent leaders will then at least have the opportunity to modify these practices to suit the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse families. Some examples include the sharing of positive behavioral support techniques, the provision of communication devices, and strategies to address the impact of welfare reform and SSI cutbacks on children with disabilities.

Further, researchers are accustomed to long delays for the final and conclusive results of a study. However, families, who have already been long underserved could benefit from the "best guesses" of PAR teams. Even when findings are incomplete, the partial results may have useful applications for underserved families. Moreover, follow-up support after the completion of the research is essential to ensure that the research does not leave a family or a community less well off than it was before the research was conducted.

Another challenge the partnership faces will be to find ways to ensure that parents gain confidence in their new roles as research leaders, co-researchers and ongoing advisors. Too often researchers use technical

terms that intimidate and confuse family participants. The partners will have to find meaningful ways to communicate sometimes complex cultural and linguistic issues, theories, and research methods.

Perhaps the most challenging areas of the partnership will be to come to a common understanding and agreement about values with regard to research. For Consortium member programs, research must lead to social change. If it does not, it is not worth the energy.

PAR Challenges for Researchers

One of the biggest and most pervasive challenges for researchers on PAR teams is simply that PAR takes more time. Because PAR values and employs a democratic group process that benefits from the contributions of all PAR team members, group decisions are made only after the whole group has had time to learn from the diverse perspectives of all team members. Members of a PAR team may not always easily reach consensus during a single meeting or conference call, and often multiple meetings/conversations need to occur before a common understanding is reached and all PAR team members are comfortable moving ahead. Researchers accustomed to working alone and making unilateral decisions may feel frustrated by and have concerns about how much time it takes to implement PAR.

Because PAR brings together team members working in a variety of organizations in a variety of different contexts, the team as a whole may discover that the pace of individual team members and the capacity of their organizations may also be quite different. The universities that are home to most researchers typically have office staff, fax machines, access to e-mail, multiple university library systems, and high speed copy machines. The result is that researchers have the capacity to accomplish their primary mission (write grants and carry out research) in a time- efficient way. Parents representing parent programs in traditionally underserved communities generally operate out of their homes with no administrative support and perhaps, at most, a fax machine and a computer. This lack of administrative support, coupled with the fact that the primary mission of parent program directors is providing direct support to families, may mean that parent program directors move at a slower pace in accomplishing the research goals of the PAR team. When parent program directors are responding to the needs of families in crisis, they may not be immediately available to complete a PAR team activity. Researchers may find the turnaround time needed for accomplishing PAR tasks is longer than they expect and that even granting agency time lines allow.

The time/pace factors in PAR activities are accompanied by a related financial reality. Group decision making, because it usually involves more time spent in multiple meetings and conversations, costs more in terms of staff time and conference call/meeting expenses. Researchers are often conducting their research on limited grant funds and limited time available in the grant cycle. Until public and private funding agencies recognize the value of PAR and provide sufficient funding and time to support PAR activities, researchers may feel torn between wanting to implement PAR and yet having insufficient funds and time to do so.

Another financial reality that may be new and perhaps unsettling for researchers is the need to build a project budget that compensates all PAR team members for their contributions to the collaborative effort. Historically when parents have been involved in research, they have participated

only as respondents. Perhaps they were compensated for responding to questionnaires or participating in focus groups, but because they were not involved in other ways, there was no line item for their participation as PAR team project personnel. Generally, grants are submitted by researchers at universities, and the budgets are prepared by the universities. Researchers may have some hesitancies about carving the already-limited budget pie into even more pieces.

One of the most serious challenges to PAR is the belief held by many researchers that PAR research is less rigorous than that conducted by researchers alone. Because most parents have not been formally trained in research methodologies, some researchers believe involving them in decisions about research design will lead to a weaker design and one that favors family-friendly methods over scientifically rigorous methods. Researchers who work on PAR teams with parents may find that their professional colleagues give less value to their work and that the work of the PAR team is less likely to be accepted for publication in peer-reviewed journals or presentation at national conferences than work done solely by researchers. Researchers depend on publication in peer-reviewed journals and presentations at national conferences for their own career growth—without these kinds of additions to the vitae, promotions within the university system are considerably more difficult. Until PAR becomes more widely accepted and valued, researchers may be hesitant to risk their own professional careers by participating on PAR teams.

PAR is based on shared responsibilities in all phases of research—determining the research questions, designing the study, analyzing the data, and preparing and disseminating the final products. Some researchers may find it difficult to share authorship of the final reports about the research. Universities often consider the number of solo and lead authorship articles in peer-reviewed journals that a researcher has when they make decisions about tenure and promotions. PAR-generated articles are produced by the PAR team and typically have multiple authors. Until there are changes in university systems, participation on a PAR team may not lead to the kind of career enhancement opportunities that researchers seek.

PAR Partnership Promises

While challenges do exist for PAR teams of parents and researchers, the PAR experience brings with it opportunities that typically do not exist in more traditional research. In this section, we discuss some promises for families from underserved communities and for researchers that may evolve from PAR collaborations.

PAR Promises for Families from Underserved Communities

Some educational researchers accept and celebrate the differences that exist within our ethnically diverse citizenry. They are discovering the need for a larger, more encompassing truth —one that is as diverse as the cultures and communities that make up this country. In response, some parents are realizing the need to move past their fears and participate in the kind of research that makes solutions to problems meaningful to them and of practical use in raising their children. A promise of PAR for families from underserved communities is that partnerships between families and researchers will mean that research will be more relevant for families and will, in fact, make immediate positive differences in their lives. For families, PAR presents a long-awaited opportunity to partner with researchers to find realistic solutions for improving the quality of their lives. Through the

PAR process, families, individual members—their faces, personalities and the conditions they face daily in their communities—will become real in the minds and hearts of researchers. Once that happens, the needs and concerns of these families will take on unprecedented priority in the research community.

Families from underserved communities, through their ongoing interactions with researchers, will be able to dispel myths and misconceptions that may be held by researchers. Researchers will, in turn, through their interactions with these families, discover the potential these families have for introducing nontraditional, culturally based approaches to problem solving that may be applied in research across cultures. A new, confident, and enduring leadership will emerge among culturally and linguistically diverse families in underserved communities, supported by researched-based information, that will command the attention and respect of people of good will everywhere.

Together, researchers and families will develop a new "cooperative language" that allows them to work together without fear that culture and context of their lives will be lost in narrow translations. Families will then never have to suffer the kind of violence that occurs when their experiences and perspectives are documented and presented without their involvement.

Through the PAR experience and because they will have research-based information, families will gain confidence in their abilities to comprehend and influence special education and other issues surrounding children and adults with disabilities. Armed with research-based information families will experience perhaps for the first time, empowerment to work for systems change—the same kind of empowerment that Paulo Freire says can results when adults learn literacy skills for the first time:

> In fact, those who, in learning to read and write, come to a new awareness of selfhood and begin to look critically at the social situation in which they find themselves, often take the initiative in acting to transform the society that has denied them this opportunity of participation (Freire, 1970, p. 9).

Families will also grow to appreciate the power of research as they implement research-based, best practices in their homes and communities. As these research-based, best practices take hold in communities, more and more families, beyond those on the PAR team, will discover a new perspective of the research community through its commitment to partner with culturally and linguistically diverse families to create positive social change.

Families as research partners will ensure that researchers see the importance of joining with them to solicit the allocation of resources for implementation of established and promising best practices. Thus, the acquisition of resources becomes a goal and expected outcome and promise of PAR. These resources will serve to actually improve the quality of life for children and adults with disabilities in underserved communities.

News of research breakthroughs and advances will inspire lasting hope and joy in the realization that families from underserved communities will finally share in the benefits. The word will be spread across communities, and the resources will follow until no one in America will live outside of the promise.

This partnership will provide a model for collaboration between sophisticated, highly developed research entities and families all across this nation in the interest of improving the quality of life for all children and adults

with disabilities everywhere. The promise is that PAR teams composed of researchers and culturally and linguistically diverse families will discover a new relationship that broadens the scope of their commitment to research as a means of social change and contributes to a deeper understanding of the critical role research plays in finding practical solutions for families. For underserved families, PAR rekindles the hope that there are answers through research that will indeed reach their families—answers that will make an immediate, relevant, and meaningful difference in their day to day lives.

PAR Promises for Researchers

The PAR process by its very nature involves a sharing of perspectives, wisdom, and expertise by all PAR team members. The commitment of the PAR team to decisions by consensus and decisions made out of shared perspectives means that time for this important sharing is built into the PAR experience. Life offers few such opportunities for learning about and valuing the richness of each PAR team member's perspective. Participation on a PAR team with parents from underserved communities is a powerful opportunity for personal growth and for the enhancement of one's own cultural competency. The PAR process for most researchers is unlike any other, and researchers who are open to new experiences often find the PAR process to be stimulating and intellectually challenging.

While those who are not experienced in PAR fear that the PAR process diminishes the scientific rigor of research, successful PAR teams find the opposite to be true. A PAR team of parents and researchers working to determine the efficacy of one-to-one Parent to Parent support discovered that the recruitment strategies suggested by the parents on the PAR team allowed the PAR team to recruit many more parents than the researchers thought possible (Parent to Parent Consortium Team, 1994; Santelli et al, 1997). The larger sample size added greater weight to the results of the statistical analyses—thus increasing the rigor of the findings.

PAR also increases the relevance of the research. While some research topics are chosen out of the researchers' priority intellectual interests, most researchers prefer to engage in research that will be meaningful and useful to others. PAR creates research opportunities that, because the research questions are mutually defined by the PAR team, are guaranteed to be of interest and more relevant to a wider audience.

Conclusion

In summary, the process of PAR involves a shift from a business-as-usual to a business-in-a-new-way mind set. Researchers and parents in underserved communities on PAR teams must come to the PAR experience with a willingness to acknowledge their respective histories but not let past histories pre-determine the outcome, and to recognize that a multicultural partnership between researchers and underserved families is a concept that is not embraced by all families or by all researchers. Courage will be required by all partners to withstand the inevitable critique from the groups represented in the partnership and to explore new ways without feeling threatened by the unknown. We conclude with our shared commitment to the position suggested by Martin Luther King Jr.:

> Cowardice asks the question, is it safe? Expedience asks the question, is it politic? But conscience asks the question, is it right? And

there comes a time when one must take a position that is neither safe, nor politic, nor popular, but he and she must make it because their conscience tells them it is right.

References

Bruyère, S. M. (1993). Participatory action research: Overview and implications for family membres of persons with disabilities. *Journal of Vocational Rehabilitation, 3*(2), 62-68.

Carnine, D. (1997). Bridging the research-to-practice gap. *Exceptional Children, 63*, 513- 521.

Fenton, J., Batavia, A., & Roody, D. (1993). *Proposed policy statement for the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research on constituency-oriented research and dissemination (CORD)*. Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research.

Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed* (M. B. Ramos, Trans.). New York: Herder & Herder.

Fuchs, D., & Fuchs, L. S. (1990, October-November). Making educational research more important. *Exceptional Children*, 102-107.

Kaufman, M., Schiller, E., Birman, B., & Coutinho, M. (1993). A federal perspective on improving practices, programs, and policies in special education. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 16*, 263-269.

Kozol, J. (1991). *Savage inequalities: Children in America's schools*. New York: Crown.

Kritek, P. B. (1994). *Negotiating at an uneven table*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Malouf, D. B., & Schiller, E. P. (1994, August). *Practice and research in special education* (Manuscript 93140-R). Washington, DC: U. S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

McTaggart, R. (1991). Principles for participatory action research. *Adult Education Quarterly, 41*, 168-187.

Parent to Parent Consortium Team. (1994, April). *Participatory action research: Families and researchers in partnership*. Presentation at the 7th International Parent to Parent Conference, Asheville, NC.

Report of the Committee on Labor and Human Resources, S. 717, 105th Cong., 1st Sess. (1997).

Santelli, B., Singer, G. H. S., DiVenere, N., Ginsburg, C., & Powers, L. E. (1997). *Participatory Action Research: A case study*. Unpublished manuscript.

Som, M. P. (1994). *Of water and the spirit: Ritual, magic, and initiation in the life of an African shaman*. New York: Putnam.

Turnbull, A. P., Friesen, B. J., & Ramirez, C. (1995, April). *Forging collaborative partnerships with families in the study of disability*. Paper presented at the National indtitute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) Conference on Participatory Action Research, Washington, DC.

Turnbull, A. P., & Turnbull, H. R. (1993). Participatory research on cognitive coping: From concepts to research planning. In A. P. Turnbull, J. M. Patterson, S. K. Behr, D. L. Murphy, J. G. Marquis, & M. J. Blue-Banning (Eds.), *Cognitive coping, families, and disability* (pp. pp. 1-14). Baltimore: Paul H. Brookes.

Turnbull, H. R., & Turnbull, A. P., with Senior Staff. (1989). *Report of the Consensus Conference on Principles of Value-based Family Research*. Lawrence, KS: University of Kansas, Beach Center on Families and Disability.

Whyte, W. F. (Ed.). (1991). *Participatory action research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Promoting Inclusion through Exito: An Integrated Assessment and Instruction Professional Development Model

J. S. de Valenzuela, Ph.D., and Leonard Baca, Ph.D., University of Colorado at Boulder
Candace Clark, Special Education Local Plan Area of Monterey County

Abstract

Exito is a professional development model for special education assessment and instruction of culturally and linguistically diverse students. It differs from traditional inservice programs in both process and content. The Exito process (the professional development model) is founded on new models of professional development which foster active involvement in learning, supports and encourages collaboration among school-based team members, allows for reflection on and discussion of key concepts, focuses on real problems of practice, and has as a goal reform of assessment and instructional practices for culturally and linguistically diverse learners. The content of Exito (the assessment model) is based on the interactive paradigm of assessment, which takes as a fundamental perspective that reality is subjective and that society is heterogeneous. This model was initially developed in response to the local needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students and the special education personnel in the Monterey County Special Education Local Plan Area (SELPA). Since its inception, it has been implemented in other parts of California, as well as throughout the country.

Exito is a professional development model for special education assessment and instruction of culturally and linguistically diverse students. The name 'Exito' derives from Spanish, meaning *success*, as it is designed to improve the academic success of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students who have been historically and currently misrepresented in programs for special education (Harry, 1994). This model differs from descriptions of best practices in bilingual special education, such as AIM for the BESt (Ortiz & Rivera, 1990; Ortiz & Wilkinson, 1991; Wilkinson, 1989) and the Optimal Learning Environment, OLE, (Ruiz, 1989; Ruiz, 1995b; Ruiz & Figueroa, 1995) in that its focus is on the professional development process, rather than on specific best practices. This model incorporates such best practices of assessment and instruction into the content of the professional development program. The purpose of this paper is to de-

scribe this model professional development program and the assessment model it incorporates.

Exito was designed to facilitate the assessment and instruction of culturally and linguistically diverse children through ongoing professional development. The rationale for the development of this program is the recognition that schools today are under a great deal of pressure to provide alternative assessment practices, including the use of informal assessment instruments and instructional interventions, due to a growing number of critical issues. Schools face high umbers of referrals of CLD students to special education and there is a problem of both under- and, to a greater extent, over-representation of these students in special education (Office for Civil Rights, 1994). Educators must face the reality that the terms used to describe students may no longer be useful and valid (Stainback & Stainback, 1984). Concerns have also been raised about the appropriateness and effectiveness of the traditional instructional environment for CLD students in both general and special education classrooms (Jordan, 1995; Ruiz, 1995a; Tharp, 1989). There are many challenges for educators today that relate directly from the above changing realities and the fact that many professionals have not been explicitly taught to deal with diversity issues during their professional training programs (Evans, Torrey, & Newton, 1997). The Exito model has a strong foundation in both the professional development and best practices literature. These can be seen as the process and content components of the Exito model.

Process

The manner in which the Exito professional development program is carried out is supported by the current literature which is consistent in the critique of traditional teacher "in service" opportunities. Lieberman (1995) states that "the conventional view of staff development as a transferable package of knowledge to be distributed to teachers in bite-sized pieces needs radical rethinking" (pp. 591-592). Little (1993) argued that:

> The dominant training model of teachers' professional development—a model focused primarily on expanding an individual repertoire of welldefined and skillful classroom practice—is not adequate to the ambitious visions of teaching and schooling embedded in present reform initiatives. Emerging alternatives to the training model, though small in scale, embody assumptions about teacher learning and the transformation of schooling that appear more fully compatible with the complex demands of refoim and the equally complex contexts of teaching. (p.129)

This statement by Little explicitly recognizes the link between new forms of professional development and school reform initiatives. This link was

also elaborated in the report by the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future which "concluded that the reform of elementary and secondary education depends first and foremost on restructuring its foundation, the teaching profession" (Darling-Hammond, 1996, p.193). This reform relies on the ability of teachers to understand complex content areas from the perspectives of students from diverse backgrounds (Darling-Hammond & McLaughlin, 1995). Exito is explicitly designed to assist teachers in this ongoing process of understanding schooling as it impacts these students, as well as impact school and district-wide special education assessment reform efforts.

Specific suggestions for implementing such reforms can be found in the professional development literature. Lieberman (1995) suggested that "people learn best through active involvement and through thinking about and becoming articulate about what they have learned" (p. 592). Therefore, she argues that schools need to (a) construct new roles for teachers and staff; (b) create new structures, such as problem-solving teams; (c) work on new projects, such as standards development or proposal writing; and (d) to create a school-wide culture of inquiry. Smylie (1996) also found that active learning is important for professional development. He extended his argument to state that teachers learning opportunities should be focused on the concrete tasks of day-to-day work with their students. He added that:

> Teachers' opportunities to learn should be problem oriented and grounded in inquiry, experimentation, and reflection. They should be collaborative, involving interaction with other teachers and educational professionals as sources of new ideas and feedback. These opportunities should be coherent, intensive, and ongoing. They should be instrumentally connected, at least in part, to broader goals for student learning and school improvement. (p. 10)

Darling-Hammond and McLaughlin (1995) echoed these observations when they define professional development as "providing occasions for teachers to reflect critically on their practice and to fashion new knowledge and beliefs about content, pedagogy, and learners" (p. 597). They identified six key characteristics: (a) teacher engagement in concrete tasks, accompanied by reflection; (b) a grounding in participant-driven inquiry, reflection, and experimentation; (c) collaboration and focus on teachers' community of practice, rather than individual teachers; (d) a connection to and basis in teachers' work with students; (e) a connection to other aspects of school change; and (f) charactenzed as "sustained, ongoing, intensive, and supported by modeling, coaching, and the collective solving of specific problems of practice" (p. 598).

As a model process for professional development, Exito is designed to incorporate these findings. Exito is a model for on-going professional development that fosters active involvement in learning, supports and encourages collaboration among school-based team members, allows for reflection on and discussion of key concepts, focuses on real problems of practice, and has as a goal reform of assessment and instructional practices for culturally and linguistically diverse learners.

Content

The content of the Exito model was developed in direct response several recurrent themes in the special education literature: the misrepresentation of CLD students in special education, assessment reform, and prereferral intervention. As discussed prior, it has been recognized that plurality (minority) group membership correlates highly with referral to special education. Because of this ongoing problem, the use of standardized tests with CLD children has come under scrutiny (Valdes & Figueroa, 1994). Informal measures have been suggested as providing a more accurate indication of student ability in CLD populations and there is growing recognition that CLD students must be assessed in both their native language and English and that their cultural background be considered during assessment (de Valenzuela & Cervantes, in press; Lopez-Reyna & Bay, 1997). Additionally, pre-referral interventions have come to be considered critical to the appropriate referral of students to special education (Baca & de Valenzuela, 1994; Graden, 1989; Graden, Casey, & Christenson, 1985). All of these topics are addressed in the Exito professional development program.

The Exito assessment model is based on the interpretive assessment paradigm. This description is based on a framework for describing assessment paradigms and theoretical models in special education (Mercer, 1992; Mercer & Rueda, 1991). This framework is depicted in Figure 1 and is based on Burrell and Morgan's (1979) proposal of two dimensions which can be used to differentiate between scientific paradigms: the assumed nature of reality and the assumed nature of society. Assumptions about the nature of reality range from the belief that reality is objective and knowable to the belief that all knowledge is inherently subjective. The nature of society refers to the belief in the heterogeneity of society and whether one perceives differences as a source of conflict.

HOMOGENEOUS/CONSENSUAL

Interpretive	Consensual/Objectivist
• social system model	• psychometric model
• humanistic models	• cognitive model
• individualized models	• medical model
SUBJECTIVITY	**OBJECTIVITY**

Conflictual/Interpretive	Conflictual/Ojectivist
• advocacy-oriented assessment	• pluralistic model
• critical theory	

HETEROGENEOUS/CONFLICTUAL

(adapted from Mercer & Rueda, 1991 and Mercer, 1992)

Figure 1. Competing Assessment Paradigms

Members of the educational community have fundamental differences regarding these basic assumptions and these differences frequently underlie debates about best practices. The major theories in assessment and learning can be placed in this framework according to their underlying world views. The still-prevalent psychometiic model is based on the assumptions that (a) disabilities are an objective, knowable reality and (b) that society is homogeneous. Without either one of these assumptions, the current statistical definition of disability would not be possible. Given the current controversy about the nature of learning disabilities as socially constructed (see Sleeter, 1986; 1987) and the reality of our heterogeneous, multicultural society, cleaiiy these assumptions are no longer tenable.

In contrast to the consensual/objectivist paradigm, within which the psychometric model is located, researchers who argue that that disability is a socially constructed phenomenon hold an interpretive perspective. Exito relies on this perspective when teaching educators about assessment practices. This perspective holds that reality is subjective and that behavioral norms develop through societal consensus which can change over time

and contexts. Mercer (1992) contrasted the interpretive and psychomedical models as following:

> Where the psychomedical model sees "mental retardation" as an objective, empirical fact, the social system model sees it as a social construction. Because the definition of "mental retardation" is socially negotiated, it not only varies from society to society but changes over time. Where the psychomedical model sees "mental retardation" as a disability that one "has," the interpretive model sees it as a status that one holds as a result of a variety of social contingencies. A person can be "retarded" in one group and not in another. Retardation is a social enactment.. (p. 25)

Development of the Exito Model

The Exito program was designed eleven years ago by Candace Clark, a program specialist for the California Monterey County Special Education Local Planning Area (SELPA), and Leonard Baca, a professor in Bilingual Special Education at the University of Colorado at Boulder and the director of the BUENO Center for Multicultural Education. It was developed in direct response to the needs of the growing culturally and linguistically diverse student populations found in the 27 local school districts in Monterey County, California.

Information from the California Department of Education regarding enrollments as of the Spring, 1996 indicates the following (Educational Demographics Unit, 1996). Monterey is a relatively small county, with a total student enrollment of 66,385. The total number of LEP students within the county is 21,517. However, although Monterey ranks just 11th within California by total number of LEP students, it ranks third in the state, behind only Imperial and Los Angeles counties, in terms of the percentage of LEP students in the total student population. The percentage of LEP students in Monterey country is 32.4% and in the state as a whole, the percentage of LEP students is 24.2%. Within the population of LEP students, Spanish is by far the most commonly spoken language in the county, with a reported 20,325 speakers out of the total 21,517 LEP students. This percentage, 94.5%, is higher than that in the state as a whole; Spanish is the primary language of 79.3% of all LEP students state-wide. Additionally, a higher percent of the Hispanic students in Monterey County are classified as LEP (56%) than in the state as a whole (49.6%).

Other information from the California Department of Education's Educational Demographics Unit (1996) indicates that the number of limited-English proficient students in Monterey county has risen significantly within the past few years. Since 1990, the LEP student count has risen from 14,953 to 21,517. During that same period of time, the fluent-English-proficient student population has remained relatively unchanged. Yet, the total number of certified bilingual and English language development (ELD) teach-

ers is only 569. These data support the need for a professional development program such as Exito.

Originally, Exito was devised as a one day inservice program. Although initial participant response was positive, little or no changes in actual service delivery patterns were noted following the training. Therefore, the following year Baca and Clark presented two days of inservices regarding alternative assessment methods with culturally and linguistically diverse students. Again, reactions to the presentations were positive, but actual changes in practice patterns were not effected. Therefore, the current professional development model, utilizing multiple sessions over a one year period, was developed to facilitate the move from passive knowledge to active change in assessment practice patterns.

The current program has been in effect for the past nine years, with a year-long series of eight sessions provided every other year. The presentations are directed to both regular and special education staff, in an interactive format using a combination of lectures, discussions, overhead transparencies, guided notes, handouts, and interactive small group activities. School-based teams are encouraged to attend the sessions together. The target participants include the following: school psychologists, resource specialists, speech and language specialists, directors of special education, building principals, child/student study team members, and ancillary staff. During the years when sessions are not offered, on-site observation and assistance is made available. Thus far, six school districts within Monterey county, as well as others in different parts of the state, have received extensive exposure to the Exito model.

Program Design

The Exito assessment model is a refined process of data collection designed to generate a portfolio of information about the English Language Learner (ELL) who *may* be potentially referred for special education assessment. Introduction to the Exito assessment model begins with cultural difference and second language acquisition theory. Participants learn that portfolio compilation begins at the *prereferral level* with structured observations of the classroom, suggestions for interventions and modifications, and the evaluations of the interaction between student and teacher. Emphasis at this level is placed on the avoidance of inappropriate referrals to special education.

When lack of sufficient progress is noted in response to the modifications attempted during the prereferral process, the data collection process may shift to special education. The issues addressed during professional development sessions that pertain to this portion of the assessment process include: standardized test validity and reliability, cross validation of assessment information through the use f informal assessment measures, the use of interpreters and translators in the ssessment and conference

environment, development of clinical judgment, and team dynamics.

The goals of the Exito professional development program are:

- to refine district policies and procedures concerning the referrals of culturally and linguistically diverse (CLD) students to special education, to create an assessment environment that is student-need driven, and
- to empower all members of regular education referral teams and special education assessment teams with the ability to formulate clinical judgments about the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students.

To attain these goals, the Exito assessment model addresses six major factors that impact culturally and linguistically appropriate assessment of CLD students.

- Exito assesses the instructional environment.
- Exito assesses the referral process factors that exist in the local school program.
- Exito uses the student's native language.
- Exito assesses student skills.
- Exito uses informal assessment as well as standardized assessment measures.
- Exito relies ultimately on team generated clinical judgment.

The attention placed on these six factors allows participants to begin to answer more in-depth questions about students and the assessment process. Participants begin to ask what they know about the students' culture, their level of language proficiency, learning styles, instructional needs, and the education environment. They begin to question the appropriateness of standardized measures and the impact of modifications in the administration and scoring of standardized measures. Educators begin to question their knowledge about the use of interpreter/translators in the assessment process and the cross-validation of data through the use of multiple examiners, multiple techniques, and assessment in multiple contexts.

The answers to these questions are expected outcomes of the Exito professional development. Through the professional development process, participants learn how the Exito assessment model addresses the major factors that impact the assessment and instruction of CLD students. The instructional environment in which educators encounter the student can be assessed through exploration of cultural issues that impact teacher perceptions, understanding of the effect of second language acquisition on student achievement, and evaluation of the educational environment. Assessment of referral process factors that exist in the local school program can be achieved by refining the referral process, selecting and administering assessment instruments, claiifying assessment issues and developing clinical judgment. Use of the student's native language is facilitated by participants' increased understanding of the effect of second language acqui-

sition on student achievement and the rationale and techniques for effective use of the native language. Using the Exito assessment model, educators assess student study skills by identifying cultural issues, understanding second language acquisition, selecting and administering assessment instruments, and by developing informal assessment instruments. Pailicipants are empowered to utilize informal assessment through the claiification of assessment issues and the development of informal assessment measures. Finally, team generated clinical judgment is facilitated through clarification of issues and the acquisition of the skills needed for the development of clinical judgment.

The Exito professional development program is divided into eight sessions, with clearly defined objectives for each session. The successful acquisition of these outcomes allows the participants to address all six assessment factors identified in the Exito assessment model. Session one focuses on *identifying cultural issues that impact teacher perceptions.* The outcome objectives for this session are for participants to define culture in their own words and identify culturally appropriate behaviors that might be misinterpreted by mainstream staff. Session two targets *understanding the effect of second-language acquisition on student achievement,* with the predicted outcomes that participants be able to define the difference between social and academic language, relate second-language acquisition to Child Study Team (CST)/Student Study Team (SST) decision making, and evaluate student readiness for English-only instruction. Session three looks at *refining the referral process.* Outcomes for the participants of this session are to review CST/SST procedures (potential models), list critical data for CST/SST referrals, and select CST/SST procedures for limited-English-proficient (LEP) students. Session four focuses on *consideration of the educational environment.* The expected outcomes are to review research on effective instruction, discuss learning style preferences of both students and teachers, and explore methods of evaluating the classroom environment for effective instruction through observation and interview. Session five highlights *selecting and administering assessment instruments.* The outcome objectives of this session *are* to review the history and criticisms of assessment practices, discuss current options for LEP assessment, select the most appropriate instruments for an assessment battery for each participant's school population, review methods for instrument adaptation, review methods for alternative scoring, and refine the evaluation process at each participant's school site. Session six looks at *developing infonnal assessment measures,* with the objectives of reviewing four methods of informal assessment, identifying the "presenting problem", and designing informal measures for use at each participant's school site. Session seven focuses on *using the interpreter/translator in the school setting.* Through this session, participants will learn to identify when native language is used, define how to use interpreter/translators for assessment,

and define how to use interpreter/translators for conferences. The objective of the final session, *developing clinical judgment*, is for participants to blend formal and informal data for diagnostic purposes and enhance collaborative team diagnosis.

Conclusion

The ultimate goal of professional development activities is not simply to foster heightened teacher awareness, knowledge of new practices and/or ability to work with students, it is to stimulate school reform. Without such a goal, the potential effect of any such activities will be limited. Professional development must reach beyond the individual teacher to stimulate an environment where changes in practice are encouraged and where collaboration between educators allows for the exchange of new ideas and fosters the development of a learning community. This learning community supports teachers in developing solutions that take into account their local context and encourages them "to discover and develop practices that embody central values and principles, rather than to implement, adopt, or demonstrate practices thought to be universally effective" (Little, 1993, p.133).

If such a goal is to be attained, model professional development programs must attend to both process and content issues. Both are critical, as attention to one to the exclusion of the other will decrease the impact of the program on effecting school reform. While there are several recognized models of best practices in bilingual special education, models of professional development that incorporate such best practices are less common. This article described one such effort that focuses on best practices in assessment through an evolving model of professional development. The Exito model is based on the assumption that:

> the most promising forms of professional development engage teachers in the pursuit of genuine questions, problems, and curiosities, over time, in ways that leave a mark on perspectives, policy, and practice. They communicate a view of teachers not only as classroom experts, but also as productive and responsible members of a broader professional community and as persons embarked on a career that may span 30 years or more (Little, 1993, p. 133).

Nonetheless, it must be recognized that change does not come quickly or easily. Exito is a dynamic collaborative model designed to effect procedural changes on a district level, which is a lofty goal, indeed. However, we have found that in order to create real change, we must move slowly, start small, make a plan with vision, and empower and involve those who we are asking to change. We must recognize that change is very greedy, in terms of money, time, people, and resources. Additionally, it is important to be aware that those who most often complain about the need for change, may suddenly become very invested in familiar habits when the time for actual

change is now. Therefore, extensive professional development carried out over a significant period of time, with follow-up support and an emphasis on team work and individual empowerment for change, such as that provided in Exito, appears to be the best approach for motivating real educational reform.

References

Baca, L., & de Valenzuela, J. S. (1994). *Reconstructing the bilingual special education interface* (Program Information Guide 20). Washington, DC: National Clearinghouse for Bilingual Education.

Burrell, G., & Morgan, G. (1979). *Sociological paradigms and organisational analysis*. Portsmouth, NH: Heinemann.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1996). What matters most: A competent teacher for every child. *Phi Delta Kappan, 78*, 193-200

Darling-Hammond, L., & McLaughlin, M. W. (1995). Policies that support professional development in an era of reform. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76*, 597-604.

de Valenzuela, J. S., & Cervantes, H. (in press). Procedures and techniques for assessing the bilingual exceptional child. In L. Baca & H. Cervantes (Eds.), *The bilingual special education interface* (3rd ed.,). New York: Merrill.

Educational Demographics Unit; Research, Evaluation and Technology Division; California Department of Education. (1996). *Language census report for California public schools*. Sacramento, CA: Author.

Evans, E. D., Torrey, C. C., & Newton, S.D. (1997). Multicultural requirements in teacher certification. *Multicultural Education, 4*, 9-11.

Graden, J. L. (1989). Redefining "prereferral" intervention as intervention assistance: Collaboration between general and special education. *Exceptional Children, 56*, 227-231.

Graden, J. L., Casey, A., & Christenson, S. L. (1985). Implementing a prereferral intervention system: Part I. The model. *Exceptional Children, 51*(5), 377-384.

Harry, B. (1994). *The disproportionate representation of minority students in special education: Theories and recommendations*. Alexandria, VA: National Association of State Directors of Special Education.

Jordan, C. (1995). Creating cultures of schooling: Historical and conceptual background of the KEEP/Rough Rock collaboration. *The Bilingual Research Journal, 19*, 83-100.

Lieberman, A. (1995). Practices that support teacher development: Transforming conceptions of professional learning. *Phi Delta Kappan, 76*, 591-596.

Little, J. W. (1993). Teachers' professional development in a climate of educational reform. *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15*, 129-151.

Lopez-Reyna, N. A., & Bay, M. (1997). Enriching assessment: Using varied assessments for diverse learners. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 29(4)*, 33-37.

Mercer, J. R. (1992). The impact of changing paradigms of disability on mental retardation in the year 2000. In L. Rowitz (Ed.), *Mental Retardation in the year 2000* (pp. 15-38). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Mercer, J. R., & Rueda, R. (1991, November). *The impact of changing paradigms of disability on assessment for special education*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Council for Exceptional Children.

Mercer, J., & Rueda, R. (1991). *A model for describing competing assessment paradigms*. Unpublished manuscript.

Office for Civil Rights. (1994). *1992 elementary and secondary school civil rights compliance report: Reported and projected enrollment data for the nation*. Washington, DC: Office for Civil Rights, U.S. Department of Education.

Ortiz, A. A., & Rivera, C. (1990). *AIM for the BESt: Assessment and intervention model for bilingual exceptional students* (Contract 300-87-0131). Washington, DC: Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Education Affairs.

Ortiz, A. A., & Wilkinson, C. Y. (1991). Assessment and intervention model for the bilingual exceptional student (AIM for the BEST). *Teacher Education and Special Education, 14*(1), 35-42.

Ruiz, N. T. (1989). An optimal learning environment for Rosemary. *Exceptional Children. 56*, 130-144.

Ruiz, N. T. (1995a). The social construction of ability and disability: I. Profile types of Latino children identified as language learning disabled. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 28*, 476-490.

Ruiz, N. T. (1995b). The social construction of ability and disability: II. Optimal and at-risk lessons in a bilingual special education classroom. *Journal of Learning Disabilities, 28*, 491-502.

Ruiz, N. T., & Figueroa, R. A. (1995). Learning-handicapped classrooms with Latino students: The Optimal Learning Environment (OLE) Project. *Education and Urban Society, 27*, 463-483.

Sleeter, C. (1987). Literacy, definitions of learning disabilities, and social control. In B. M. Franklin (Ed.), *Learning disabilities: Dissenting essays* (pp. 67-87). London: The Falmer Press.

Sleeter, C. E. (1986). Learning disabilities: The social construction of a special education category. *Exceptional Children, 53*, 46-54.

Smylie, M. A. (1996). From bureaucratic control to building human capital: The importance of teacher learning in education reform. *Educational Researcher, 25*, 9-11.

Stainback, W., & Stainback, S. (1984). A rationale for the merger of special and regular education. *Exceptional Children, 51*, 102.

Tharp, R. G. (1989). Psychocultural variables and constants. *American Psychologist, 44*, 349-359.

Valdes, G., & Figueroa, R. (1994). *Bilingualism and testing: A special case of bias*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Wilkinson, C. Y. (1989). AIM for the BESt: Update - An innovative approaches research project. *Bilingual Special Education Perspective, 9*, 6-7.

Intervention Strategies for CLD Students with Speech-Language Disorders

Li-Rong Lilly Cheng, Ph.D., San Diego State University

In recent years there has been a significant increase of newcomers to the United States. They bring with them various cultural, ethnic, linguistic, social and political experiences. Given the ethnic, cultural, and linguistic diversity of our student population (Olsen, 1988; U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991; Yu, 1993), knowledge of every student's language, culture, and social background is important. Moreover, cross-cultural communicative competence, or the ability to communicate effectively across cultures, needs to be developed. Educators need to integrate this competence into educational practices and curricula (Cheng, 1989; Rueda, 1993;). The purpose of this paper is to introduce some background issues concerning acquisition of social, cultural and linguistic competence and to ask critical questions about teacher preparation and curricula. Guiding principles and working suggestions leading to optimal language learning environments will also be provided.

General Issues

Hidden Curriculum

Education of language-minority students to function within hidden cognitive agendas of new socio-cultural contexts (Jackson, 1968; Philips, 1983) is an issue needing further discussion. For example, to enable academic success "counter factual" (such as, posing the question: "If you were the President of the United States, what would you do to reduce the national deficit?") and "critical thinking" (inferencing and analyzing) intrinsic to the American academic cultural system must be acquired (Bloom, 1981). These are among many cultural and cognitive assumptions underlying Western reading and writing$_1$ often taken for granted by native speakers of English and unfamiliar to language-minority students (Trueba, Cheng, & Ima, 1993). These assumptions are implied rather than taught directly, but explicit examination of "hypothetical" and "critical thinking" could be provided, including exercises reviewing the why's and wherefore's of the reasoning process.

Bilingualism

There is a critical need for educators to understand the social, language, learning, and literacy environment of their bilingual students as well as the use of specific learning and teaching strategies needed to ensure education success for this population. Information regarding optimal instructional approaches suitable to these populations is equally lacking (Chan, 1983; Chan & Kitano, 1986; Chinn, 1989; ChuChang, 1983; Figueroa, Ruiz, & Baca, 1988; Hakuta, 1986).

Social Dialect

Many students speak a social dialect other than standard English. "Social dialect theory is based on the observation that whenever social groups are divided, their language systems diverge over time" (Terrell & Terrell, 1993, p.13). Taylor (1986) described several basic principles of second-dialect instruction. For example, instruction must be preceded by non-biased assessment of the learner's knowledge of the first dialect and knowledge of the targeted second dialect.

Students learn to be bi-dialectal and to code-switch depending on social contexts. Among bilinguals, language often serves as an indicator of social group membership as well as topical demarcation. For multilingual and multicultural individuals, choice of language is often intimately tied to personal history; in fact, choice of language can serve to identify individuals sharing common cultural experiences.

A group of bilingual Chinese American students was once observed to be conversing in Cantonese about their weekend plans. When joined by an English-speaking Chinese student, the group began conversing in English, with an abrupt shift of topic. They conversed briefly about school projects with a marked change of politeness and formality toward one another. When the English speaker departed, the conversation resumed in Cantonese, shifting back to their weekend plans with the usual emotional vigor that is characteristic of Cantonese discourse.

Code-switching can be an expressive component of a competent bilingual's linguistic repertoire. Communicative competence in language must encompass the understanding of how language is used not only to negotiate information, but also to prescribe topics of discourse and group membership (T. Chen, personal communication, September 29,1995).

English as a Second Language

It has been two decades since Lau v. Nichols (1974), in which the father of a student named Kenny Lau requested that Kenny receive academic instruction in his home language, Chinese, so that he could have a comprehensible learning experience. The United States Supreme Court ruled in Mr. Lau's favor. Yet a close examination of service delivery to language minority populations reveals many inadequacies. Twenty-five years

ago, the Bilingual Education Act of 1968 (US Code Title 20,1968) was passed and then re-authorized in 1974 with full support from the federal government. Despite the passage of these laws, numerous reports have documented the inadequacies of schools in the United States in meeting the needs of students with culture and language differences (Olsen, 1988). Support for bilingual education for limited English proficient (LEP) students with special needs has declined. Currently, less emphasis is placed upon a student's primary language than on English as a second language (ESL).

Foreign-born immigrant students may present some of the following characteristics (Cheng, 1991; 1994a) when they are learning English:

- Varying levels of home language proficiency;
- Poor overall communication skills in English basic interpersonal communication skills (BICS) (Cummins, 1984);
- Lack of socio-cultural knowledge and social competence;
- Native language influence on spoken English (phonology, morphology and syntax);
- Varying levels of difficulty in auditory comprehension (especially non-literal interpretation);
- Mild to moderate difficulty with cognitive academic language proficiency (CALP) (Cummins, 1984);
- Lack of prior knowledge of and experience in American schools; and
- Lack of opportunity to practice English outside school.

Special considerations are also needed in assessing LEP students with special needs. For more information see Hamayan and Damico (1991); and Siegel and Halog (1986).

Critical Questions

Teacher Preparation

Educators, in facing diversity, need to have more knowledge and understanding of related social, linguistic, cultural, educational, and economic issues of the children they serve. Such issues may be infused into their everyday teaching. A system of rewards and appraisal may be necessary to help promote individual, personal and professional growth (Office of Bilingual Education, 1991). Multi-cultural and social literacy is necessary across the educational continuum. Teachers need to read background information about their students, (Lewis & Luangpraseut, 1989; Te, 1987), and be prepared to askthe following questions(Banks, Cortes, Gay, Garcia, & Ochoa, 1976; Chinn, 1989; Chinn & Plata, 1986; Clark & Cheng, 1993):

- What have I done to promote communication with my students and their families?
- How do I promote cross-cultural understanding among my students?
- How do my instructional strategies reflect and accommodate the learning styles of diverse students?

- Have I updated my knowledge and skills with regard to issues of diversity?
- How do I evaluate my teaching effectiveness with diverse students?
- How does my teaching encourage positive interaction between my students and me?
- What methods can I use to encourage active participation of all students?

Curriculum

Curriculum modifications may be necessary in order to meet the needs of learners from diverse backgrounds. Curriculum guides are used in order to ensure some consistency of teaching materials. However, more background information may be needed in certain areas and the following questions must be answered in order for curricula to be "user-friendly." Questions concerning effective, relevant and meaningful curricula may include (Scarcella, 1989):

- Does the curriculum reflect planning and multicultural infusion?
- Have I assessed my students' needs?
- Does my content create a positive, meaningful, and challenging environment?
- Am I implementing topics that have social and cultural relevance?
- How does the course capitalize on the rich diversity of students?
- Does the curriculum encourage students to examine events, situations, and conflicts from diverse perspectives?
- Does the curriculum promote a positive attitude toward linguistically diverse students?
- Am I clearly demonstrating concern for students' learning?
- How am I helping students develop literacy and communication skills?
- Are rules of writing and speaking explained explicitly?
- Am I providing models of good writing and speaking styles?
- Have I promoted writing across the curriculum?
- Are students participating at their level of competence?
- Have I set realistic goals and objectives that are obtainable for all students?
- Have I provided tutorial services, support materials, and counseling when necessary?
- Have I communicated with the parents/caregivers of the students?

Guiding Principles

Teachers need to be sensitive to the diverse experiences brought to school by their diverse students. In order to provide an optimal learning environment for students,a guiding philosophy needs to be established. The following guiding principles provide the basic philosophy behind intervention strategies for a culturally llinguistically diverse population:

- Increasing meta-linguistic awareness and socio-cultural literacy, going beyond phonology, morphology and syntax (Heath, 1983,1986).
- Nurturing bicultural identity and realizing present social reality (Takaki, 1989).
- Providing opportunities for exposure to various narrative styles (e.g., reporting, debating, story telling, role playing, public speaking).
- Offering an explanation of the written and unwritten rules governing the various styles of discourse (Cheng, 1994b).
- Being specific and explicit in discussing similarities and differences between languages, comparing appropriate and inappropriate language, especially when using jargon or colloquialisms.
- Learning to be sensitive to cultural differences and understanding cultural beliefs, perceptions, and values.
- Making no assumptions about what students know or do not know, anticipating their needs and greatest challenges.
- Expecting student frustration and possible misunderstanding.
- Encouraging students to join social activities and organizations to increase their exposure to different types of discourse, as language is a social tool and should be used for fulfilling multiple social needs and requirements.
- Facilitating the transition into mainstream culture through such activities as role-playing (preparing scripts for commonly occurring activities), using culturally unique experiences as topics for discussions, and conducting socialipragmatic activities (Cheng, 1989).
- Encouraging students to read all kinds of literature (e.g., fairy tales, newspapers, biographies, historical fiction, magazines, biographies, bestsellers, and poetry).

Creating An Optimal Language Learning Environment

Parents, educators, and specialists need to collaborate to provide LEP students an optimal language learning environment. Along with investigating the social, familial, and personal factors that influence ESL learning, education researchers advocate optimal learning environments (OLE) and optimal language learning environments (OLLE) for improving the quality of ESL education (Cheng, 1994a; Figuoroa, Ru iz, & Baca 1988). Furthermore, teachers are examining their world views, values, beliefs, habits, and learning and cognitive styles in hopes of understanding what cultural and linguistic "baggage" their students bring to school (Cheng, 1989).

The following is a summary of suggestions made by Cheng 1987,1990a,b, 1993; and Matsuda 1989. These may be useful in developing teacher ability to improve the communicative competence of students from diverse backgrounds:

1. *Narrative development:* Provide information on different narrative styles and the written and unwritten rules that govern them. Conduct dis-

cussions of style similarities and differences, and what is considered appropriate and inappropriate.

2. *Identity development:* Provide not only training in phonology, morphology and syntax, but also infusion of cultural literacy in pragmatics, semantics, and ritualized patterns. Develop self-esteem through valuing culture. Create opportunities for confidence-building social interaction (Trueba, 1987). Practice daily show-and-tell, in which students can share culturally familiar objects and skills. This exercise will affirm their strengths, differences, and similarities (Ima & Cheng, 1989). Infuse multicultural materials in the curriculum and extracurricular activities. Encourage students to participate in activities related to learning as well as to teaching culture. Field trips may include visits to museums, ethnic enclaves, markets and restaurants. Provide information regarding culturally familiar and unfamiliar activities such as Scouts, YMCA/YWCA, and Boys' and Girls' Clubs. Invite family or community members to speak about their ethnicity, thus allowing youngsters to share their heritage. Use this exchange to empower children and provide a school-home connection. Create a multicultural calendar. Activities celebrating other nations' holidays are richly fulfilling and relevant to the multicultural classroom. These may include the Chinese lunar calendar New Year, Hanukkah, Cinco de Mayo or Mardi Gras.

3. *Parent involvement:* Encourage parents to support literacy enhancement at home by explaining school expectations for language use and academic skills. Invite them to initiate storytelling or recountiparticipate in oral narratives, congruent with their cultural context and reading, as well as describing home activities and social events to their children. Since parents spend more time with their children than do teachers, their alliance and educational support is vital (Pang, 1988).

4. *School connection:* Investigate students' backgrounds through discussing their strengths and interests. Explain explicitly what is hidden in the school discourse for example, not raising one's hand in school indicates a lack of knowledge, preparation, or participation, and not shyness. Also worth detailing to parents are the following features of school discourse: a late response to a teacher/school inquiry may be viewed as uncooperative, a late arrival to a conference as a show of disinterest or lack of concern, and a non-response as rude or disrespectful. Educators can initiate progress within the field by providing relevant, comprehensible information and collaborating with other professionals.

5. *Literacy development:* Reading menus, road signs, labels, mail, newspapers, and magazines together can enhance literacy. Sharpen students' organizational meta-linguistic and meta-cognitive skills. This can be accomplished by having them write lists of errands or groceries, or describe sequences of events. If they are going on a field trip, ask them to categorize items they will bring.

6. *Language stimulation.* Devise activities involving description queries, such as, "Tell me about it;" open-ended questions asking who, what, where, why, or when; and questions requiring metacognitive skills (e.g.,"What do you think would happen if there were a hurricane?")

7. *Conceptual development* through questions that require critical thinking and problem solving. Some examples include: Does a large box of detergent cost more or less than a small box of detergent? This jacket is on sale for 30% off its original price of $57.99; what is the sale price? Compare and contrast the actions of two characters in a book.

8. *Story infusion:* Personal life stories are powerful transmitters of fact and information, including times, places, names, personal experiences, morals, family events, and styles of communicating. This exercise in autobiography can build another bridge between home and school discourse and culture.

Conclusion

Successful language learning strategies for culturally and linguistically diverse students need to include active student participation and construction of meaning in authentic and personally relevant activities. Outcomes are often enhanced when these students work in cooperative groups and when home-school communication is ongoing$_1$ open, and meaningful. The purpose of education is to produce academic and life success of all individual students. Our future depends on how education is provided to our students. Teachers and students facing the 21st century need to be literate in a multicultural world. Education must play an important role in preparing students to meet the human resource demands of this nation.

We need to be mindful of how the globe is shrinking. There is a great need for nations to be interdependent (Kanter, 1995). All students and teachers will benefit from direct contact with students from multilingual, multicultural backgrounds and will be more prepared to enter the global market of the 21st century.

References

Banks, J. A., Cortes, C. E., Gay, G., Garcia, R., & Ochoa, A. S. (1976). *Curriculum guidelines for multiethnic education*. Washington, D.C.: National Council for the Social Studies.

Bloom. A. H. (1981). *The linguistic shaping of thoughts: A study of the impact of language on thinking in China and the west.* Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Chan, K. S. (1983). Limited English speaking, handicapped, and poor: Triple threat in childhood. In M. Chu-Chang (Ed.), *Asian- and Pacific-American perspectives in bilingual education: Comparative research* (pp.153-171). New York: Teachers College Press.

Chan, K. S., & Kitano, M. K. (1986). Demographic characteristics of exceptional Asian students. In M. K. Kitano & P. C. Chinn (Eds.), *Exceptional Asian children and youth* (An ERIC Exceptional Child Education Report). Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Cheng, L. (1987). English communicative competence of language minority children: Assessment and treatment of language impaired preschoolers. In H. T. Trueba (Ed.), *Success or failure?* Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Cheng, L. (1989). Service delivery to Asian/Pacific LEP children: A cross-cultural framework. *Topics in Language Disorders, 9*(3), 1-14.

Cheng, L. (1990a). Facing diversity: A need for paradigm shift. *American Behavior Scientist*. London, England: Sage Publications.

Cheng, L. (1990b). The identification of communicative disorders in Asian-Pacific students. *Journal of Childhood Language Disorders. 13* (2).

Cheng, L. (1991). *Assessing Asian language performance: Guidelines for evaluating limited-English-proficient students*. Oceanside, CA: Academic Communications Associates.

Cheng, L. (1994a). Asian/Pacific students and the learning of English. In J.E. Bernthal & N. W. Bankson (Eds), *Child phonology: Characteristics. assessment. and intervention with special populations* (pp. 255-274). New York: Thieme Medical Publishers.

Cheng, L. (1994b). Difficult discourse: An Untold Asian story. In D.N. Ripich & N.A Creaghead (Eds), *School discourse problems*. San Diego, CA: Singular.

Chinn, P. C. (1989). *Training specialists to serve Asian handicapped students* (Project # H-29E9001 1, Handicapped Personnel Preparation: Special Populations). Office of Special Education Programs, U.S. Department of Education.

Chinn, P. C., & Plata, M. (1986). Perspectives and educational implications of Southeast Asian students. In M. K. Kitano & P. C. Chinn (Eds.), *Exceptional Asian children and youth (An ERIC Exceptional Child Education Report)*. Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Chu-Chang, M. (1983). *Asian- and Pacific-American perspectives in bilingual education*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Clark, L. W., & Cheng, L. (1993). Faculty challenges in facing diversity. In L. W. Clark (Ed.). *Faculty and student challenges in facing cultural and linguistic diversity*. Springfield, Ill: Charles Thomas.

Cummins, J. (1984). *Bilingual education: Issues in assessment and pedagogy*. San Diego, CA: College Hill Press.

Figueroa, R. A., Ruiz, N. T., & Baca, L. (1988). *Technical proposals for the OLE model*. Davis, CA: University of California.

Hakuta, K. (1986). *Mirror of language: The debate on bilingualism*. New York: Basic Books.

Hamayan, E. V., & Damico, J. S. (1991). *Limiting bias in the assessment of bilingual students*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life, and work in communities and classrooms*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Heath, S. B. (1986). Sociocultural contexts of language development. In *Beyond language: Social and cultural factors in schooling minority students*. Bilingual Education Office, California State Department of Education. Los Angeles, CA: Evaluation, Dissemination and Assessment Center, California State University.

Ima, K., & Cheng, L. (1989). *Climbing new mountains: The Hmong*. San Diego, CA: Los Amigos Research Associates.

Jackson, P. (1968). *Life in classrooms*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kanter, R. M. (1995). *World class: Thriving locally in the global economy*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Lau v. Nichols, 411 U.S. 563(1974).

Lewis, J., & Luangpraseut, K. (1989). *Handbook for teaching Lao-speaking students*. Folsom, CA: Folsom Cordova Unified School District, Southeast Asia Community Resource Center.

Matsuda, M. (1989). Working with Asian parents: Some communication strategies. *Topics in Language Disorders, 9*, 45-53.

Office of Bilingual Education (1991). *Schooling and language minority students: A theoretical framework*. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education.

Pang, V. O. (1988). Ethnic prejudice: Still alive and hurtful. *Harvard Education Review, 58*, 375-379.

Olsen, L. (1988). *Crossing the schoolhouse border: Immigrant students and California public schools*. San Francisco, CA: California Tomorrow.

Philips, S. (1983). *The invisible culture*. New York: Longman.

Rueda, R. S. (1993). Presentation at the Multicultural Education Summer Institute, San Diego State University, San Diego, California.

Scarcella, R.C. (1989). *Empowering university students: Providing language support services across the curriculum*. Speech delivered to the Conference on Celebrating Diversity, Oakland, California.

Siegel, V., & Halog, L. (1986). Assessment of limited English proficient children with special needs. In N. Tsuchida (Ed.), *Issues in Asian and Pacific American education* (pp.13-20). Minneapolis, MN: Asian/Pacific American Learning Resource Center.

Takaki, R. (1989). *Strangers from a different shore*. Boston, MA: Little Brown.

Taylor, O. L. (1986). *Treatment of communication disorders in culturally and linguistically diverse populations*. San Diego, CA: College Hill Press.

Te, H. D. (1987). *Introduction to Vietnamese culture*. San Diego, CA: Multifunctional Resource Center, San Diego State University.

Terrell, S. L., & Terrell, F. (1993). African-American cultures. In D. E. Battle (Ed.), *Communication disorders in multicultural populations* (pp. 3-37). Boston: Andover Medical Publishers.

Trueba, H. T. (1987). *Success or failure?* Cambridge, MA: Newbury House.

Trueba, H., & Cheng, L., & Ima, K. *(1993). Myth or reality? Adaptive strategies of Asian newcomers in California*. London: Falmer Press.

U.S. Bureau of Census (1991). *Statistical abstract of the United States: 1991* (111th ed.). Washington, D.C.

Yu, E. (1993, December 2). *Issues in studying Asian/Pacific Islander Americans*. Presentation at the Biostatisics Conference, San Diego State University, San Diego, CA.

A Study of Effective Instructional Practices by Monolingual English-Speaking and Bilingual/Bicultural Teachers in Five Programs Serving Hispanic Preschoolers with Developmental Disabilities

Jozi De Leon, Ph.D., New Mexico State University, and Laurie L. McCarty, Ph.D., Buffalo State College

Abstract

A limited number of instructional programs nationwide have been developed and implemented to specifically meet the needs of Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Exceptional (CLDE) students. With the increasing number of culturally and linguistically diverse students, many who are limited English proficient and in legitimate need of special education services, it has become necessary to establish effective programs. This study examined instructional practices in five early childhood special education classrooms serving large percentages (at least 73%) of bilingual and limited English proficient Hispanic students with disabilities. Teachers were interviewed, classrooms were videotaped and data were collected in the examination of various aspects of instruction. Results yielded recommendations for monolingual and bilingual/bicultural special education teachers working with young Hispanic students with disabilities.

Diverse Exceptional Students

The Needs of CLDE Students

Over the past 20 years, a large body of legislation has addressed the need for the provision of appropriate services to culturally and linguistically diverse/Limited English Proficient exceptional students (Salend & Fradd, 1986). This legislation has established the need for bilingual special education in the nation, especially in areas like New Mexico, which have large minority populations. As the limited English proficient population increases dramatically, it becomes imperative to meet the needs of this segment of the population.

Effective Instruction for CLDB and Young CLDE Students

Yates and Ortiz (1991) emphasized the importance of teachers understanding the relationship between students' native language and their ability to learn English as a second language (ESL). They assert that special educators, and especially those who are monolingual English speakers, must have the ability to provide ESL instruction for CLDE students using

current methods and materials. Some educators may share a concern about decreasing the amount of English instruction. Cummins (1989) argued, however, that since there is a substantial amount of transfer of cognitive skills across languages, the provision of less English instruction will not cause students' English skills to suffer. Baca (1990) argued that bilingual special educators should regard students' native language and culture as strengths and as important resources which establish the groundwork for effective education. He also highlighted his concern about the educational focus on the acquisition of English skills:

> The ultimate goal of bilingual special education is to assist the CLDE student to reach his or her maximum potential for learning. Although teaching English as well as the native language are important, they should not become the primary purpose. To do so would cause a classic means-ends conversion that could prove very harmful to the student. For example, if a special educator or a bilingual special educator would consider the acquisition of English as the CLDE student's primary need, valuable instructional time for teaching concepts and academic skills would be lost. (p. 249)

Therefore, it is important for teachers to give equal consideration to students' linguistic, cultural, academic, and special needs. Yawkey and Prewett-Diaz (1990) suggested that acculturation, which requires cultural and psychological adaptation, must occur in young children before second language development begins. Moreover, young children need to learn proper linguistic habits in order to function within a language group. There is a need, at least until the kindergarten years, for families and communities to use the primary language of the child for language and cognitive development because each culture has unparalleled characteristics of linguistic, sociolinguistic, and strategies for language use (Hardwick & Travis, 1986). According to Hardwick and Travis, a "reordering of priorities" for services to CLDE students and their families has become a necessity.

Purpose of the Study

The study examined the practices of six teachers in five special education programs in two school districts in southern New Mexico. All five programs were early childhood special education classrooms and served large percentages of Hispanic children (at least 73%). There were between 6 and 11 students in four of the classrooms. There were 24 students in the class which was taught by two teachers.

The primary purpose of this study was to identify effective instructional strategies implemented by both bilingual (Spanish and English) and monolingual (English-only) teachers. Classroom variables such as (a) teacher/student interaction, (b) language use in the classroom, (c) exemplary teaching behaviors (e.g., reinforcement, school socialization, behavior manage-

ment), and (d) multicultural and bilingual instruction were analyzed. A second purpose of this study was to determine teacher-student behaviors in the classroom, (i.e. teacher-student interaction, language use, teaching style, type of reinforcement used, and use of other exemplary instructional strategies) and to identify effective instructional strategies applied by monolingual non-Hispanic teachers and Hispanic teachers using some dual language instruction with young Hispanic children with disabilities.

Methodology

Five special education classrooms designated for preschool students identified as developmentally delayed (DD) were targeted for this study. All classrooms had at least 73% Hispanic population, with many students identified as LEP or bilingual (Spanish/English). Seventy percent of the student population was identified, according to student records, as being of Mexican background. Four of the five classrooms were located in a moderately sized school district located in the southern portion of the state, and the fifih classroom was located in an adjacent rural school district (less than 10,000 in population) approximately 15 miles from the first site. One of the classrooms was taught by two teachers.

Participants

Six teachers currently employed in five DD preschool programs were asked to participate in this study by (a) being interviewed for approximately 90 minutes, (b) filling out a questionnaire, and (c) allowing researchers to observe their classrooms for approximately three days per week over a four month period.

Instrumentation

Preliminary Site Visit

After public school sites were established, researchers visited and met with the primary teachers and administrators who would be taking part in this study. During this initial visit, the researchers distributed three "Self-Assessment" forms to the primary teachers. These forms surveyed the teachers' affitudes toward educational practices with regard to student/teacher interaction, classroom physical seffing, and instructional methods.

Teacher Interviews

Teachers participated in one interview lasting approximately 90 minutes. All six teachers were interviewed by the same researcher. The interviews took place in the teachers' classrooms approximately one month afier the onset of the research project. Teachers were asked open-ended questions which dealt with two specific areas:

1. What are the affitudes of Hispanic and non-Hispanic teachers regarding native language and second language usage in the classroom?

2. In what way do Spanish-speaking teachers and non-Spanish-speaking teachers involve Hispanic parents in the educational process?

Student Information

A second instrument used in the study was the Spanish/English Language Proficiency Screening (S/ELPS), which assessed Hispanic students' language proficiency and language dominance in English and Spanish. The S/ELPS was administered by one of the researchers. The Home Bilingual Usage Estimate (HBUE, 1971) developed by Rudolph V. Skoczylas was also administered. The HBUE consists of questions related to language usage within the child's home. These questions were answered by parents who participated in the study. The primary purpose for using the HBUE was to determine the language used in the home of each Hispanic student and to supplement the S/ELPS Language Proficiency data. With the use of these instruments a better determination was made regarding the linguistic characteristics of the Hispanic student population.

Observations of the Classroom Settings

Researcher observations and videotaping over a four-month period were utilized in order to assess teacher effectiveness with regard to instructional styles, instructional methods, and cultural themes incorporated in teaching and in the classroom.

Results

Classroom and Teacher Descriptions

Research findings are presented with brief descriptions of each preschool classroom included in the study. These descriptions are summarized in Table 1.

Classroom A, an integrated preschool, was taught by a regular education teacher who identified herself as a monolingual English speaker and a DD special education preschool teacher who was bilingual. Both teachers reported a humanistic philosophy of teaching in which the needs of the individual learner were of the utmost importance. One of the two teachers reflected on her philosophy of teaching by saying, "I look at children as individuals—educationally, emotionally, and in all areas." Videotaped observations revealed that the teachers' philosophy toward education reflected a belief in cooperative learning where children were encouraged to expand and share their own life experiences within the confines of facilitated instruction.

Classroom B is a self-contained DD preschool taught by a non-Hispanic teacher whose lprimary language is English. Teacher B indicated that her philosophy toward education is centered around creating a positive environment for children. She believes that children learn best when taught in a cooperative environment. Although Teacher B indicated that she did not speak Spanish, videotape observations revealed that she ap-

pears to be highly aware of integrating native language in a manner which reflects the subtleties and sensitivities inherent in the Mexican American culture. For example, she ofien used endearing terms such as "mijita" when talking to Spanish-speaking children, and she felt that it was important to refer to things in the classroom with Spanish words.

Classroom C was a self-contained DD preschool which was taught by a non-Hispanic teacher who stated that her primary language was English. She stated that she is child-centered and that creating a positive environment for children is important. She attempted to create a positive environment through group activities including singing, playing games, and hands-on projects. Although Teacher C believes that native language usage is necessary for Spanish-speaking children in her preschool program, she reflected an attitude of English language preference for non-English speaking children. She stated, "If we are teaching only in Spanish, we haven't helped them [Spanish-speaking children] . . . I'm frustrated because the children rattle off Spanish and I don't know what they are saying. My educational assistants can't be available all the time [for translation]."

Classroom D is a transitional pre-kindergarten program which is taught by a teacher who identified herself as Mexican American and who indicated that her primary language is English. She stated that she has a basic command of Spanish and can communicate with Spanish-speaking children and their parents. She believes that education should be interactive with an emphasis on the individual within a social context. Consequently, much of the children's school day is focused on group processes such as role playing, group stories, and group social skills activities.

Although Teacher D stated that she believed in bilingual education, she stated that in her class she primarily uses Spanish to reinforce what has been said in English.

Classroom E is a combined rural integrated DD preschool program and paid day care program for regular education preschool children. Teacher E is a special education teacher who believes that the purpose of the DD preschool is developmental in nature with a strong emphasis on citizenship and socialization. She stated that she believed bilingual education was important in an academic sense and in the development of affective attributes such as self concept. Her belief toward bilingual education is rooted in her own personal experience toward the loss of her native language.

Videotaped Observations of Monolingual (English) and Bilingual (Spanish and English) Special Educators

Videotapes were analyzed to examine teacher/student interaction and teaching behaviors applied by both monolingual and bilingual teachers. Videotapes were analyzed by two teams of observers. One team examined the videotapes for teaching behaviors while the second team observed the teachers' use of language. Both teams viewed 6 videotaped sessions

on each teacher involved in a variety of instructional activities. Interobserver reliability was determined at r = .95 to .93 for each team.

Teaching Behaviors Observed in Monolingual and Bilingual Teachers. Questioning was the predominant teaching strategy demonstrated across all classrooms, as shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2. Both monolingual and bilingual teachers appear to adhere to traditional models of teaching in which they are the transmitters of knowledge and utilize questioning techniques to assess student knowledge. Despite their use of questioning techniques, sufficient wait-time (at least 3 seconds) was often lacking.

All six teachers demonstrated insufficient attempts at conveying meaning both to the entire group and to individual students. While the bilingual teachers may have relied on the use of Spanish when a child did not understand, the monolingual teachers typically did not stop to ensure that all the children were understanding instructional activities.

Types of Language Used by Monolingual and Bilingual Teachers. Seven different uses of language were observed in the videotape analysis. Table 2 identifies calculated percentages of the types of language used by both monolingual and bilingual teachers with CLDE students. Brief descriptions of the seven types of language are provided below:

1. Maintenance (M) consisted of language in which the teacher maintained day to day language skills and was not teaching a new language skill or vocabulary.
2. Expansion (E) was determined by whether the teacher appeared to be building new language skill (i.e., "This is a zebra. What do we call it?").
3. Nonverbal Language (N) was determined by the teachers' nonverbal cues to the child.
4. Praise or Encouragement (P) consisted of any positive comment made by the teacher.
5. Reprimand or Punishment (R) consisted of negative comments made to the child by the teacher typically concerning the child's behavior or actions.
6. Academic (A) consisted of language related to the learning of school-related material.
7. Social (S) consisted of language related to the development of social/conversational skills.

Use of Language in Monolingual Classrooms. Classrooms B and C both predominantly used maintenance and academic language in their classroom instruction. The use of both maintenance and academic language has the potential of allowing students with limited English speaking ability to learn and maintain basic English language skills while acquiring some of the necessary academic language. In both classrooms, the bilingual educational assistant usually only used Spanish to provide translations of the teacher's instructions or to reprimand a student. The educational assis-

tants' fluency in Spanish is a resource which could have been incorporated into classroom activities through more collaboration between the teacher and the educational assistant.

Use of Language in Bilingual Classrooms. Classroom A used high percentages of maintenance language in both English and Spanish. Social language was also used a large percentage of the time in both languages. Academic language was demonstrated somewhat in English but was nonexistent in Spanish. This indicates that those Spanish monolingual and Spanish dominant children who need to have a foundation in Spanish and to learn academic content in their native language may be at a disadvantage academically. While there was a high degree of Spanish used in this classroom, the Spanish was used to translate nonacademic content.

Classroom D incorporated some Spanish in the classroom, however, analyses indicated insufficient use of Spanish. Despite the teacher's bilingual skills, she was very reluctant to perform any of the instructional activities in Spanish, resulting in a failure to effectively communicate with Spanish-speaking students. Her use of Spanish was typically relegated to translation when a child did not understand. This teacher used praise more than any other method observed, however, the praise was done exclusively in English. Even the use of social language in Spanish was missing in this classroom.

Classroom B used the highest degree of academic language in English and Spanish. Despite the children's exceptionalities, much of the classroom instruction focused on language development and language enrichment in both languages. Much of the social language was also conducted in Spanish. An interesting aspect of this classroom was the use of praise and terms of endearment (e.g., "Que bien, mijita [my little daughter]."), which parallel the ways in which Hispanic parents would interact with their children.

Recommendations

Recommendations for monolingual and bilingual teachers were developed by first observing the effective instructional practices which were implemented in each classroom. These strategies are listed in Table 3 and Table 4. In general, teachers were sensitive to the unique needs of their students. In an effort to better meet the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students with disabilities, monolingual and bilingual teachers should consider the recommendations provided in Table 5 and Table 6. In all cases, more training in ESL and bilingual instruction would benefit teachers and students.

In this study, most of the paraprofessionals were bilingual and from the same cultural background as the students. Their language and experience can be incorporated into the classroom in order to provide a more positive learning experience for the children whose dominant language is Spanish.

Table 7 provides a list of specific recommendations for utilizing paraprofessionals more effectively in the bilingual special education classroom.

Conclusion

Recent demographic trends indicate that our society is going to continue to change during the next two decades. Based on this information, it is imperative that educators prepare themselves to think more globally and understand that the traditional educational model is not appropriate for all children. The findings of this study indicate that both bilingual and monolingual teachers have the potential to be effective with children from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. The ultimate factor in determining the implementation of effective practices is a desire to learn about what works best, an openness to change teaching styles when necessary, and a willingness to embrace and celebrate diversity by including culturally and linguistically relevant instruction.

References

Baca, L. M. (1990). Theory and practice in bilingual/cross cultural special education: Major issues and implications for research, practice, and policy. *Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs: Proceedings of the First Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Students' Issues*. pp. 247-280).

Cummins, J. (1989). A theoretical framework for bilingual special education and related training. *Exceptional Children, 56*, 111-119.

Hardwick, H., & Travis, M. (1986). *Issues in serving young special needs children in bilingual-bicultural settings*. Washington, D.C.: Office of Special Education (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 269 922).

Salend, S. J., & Fradd, S. (1986). Nationwide availability of services for limited English proficient handicapped students. *The Journal of Special Education, 20*, 127-135.

Yates, J. R., & Ortiz, A. A. (1991). Professional development needs of teachers who serve exceptional language minorities in today's schools. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 14*, 11-18.

Yawkey, T. D., & Prewett-Diaz, J. O. (1990. Early childhood: Theories, research and implications for bilingual education. *Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Language Affairs: Proceedings of the First Research Symposium on Limited English Proficient Students' Issues* (pp. 161-192).

Table 1

Descriptions of Preschool Classrooms for Students Identified as Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Exceptional Children

Classroom A Integrated Preschool	Classroom B Traditional Self-Contained DD Preschool	Classroom C Traditional DD Preschool	Classroom D Transitional Prekindergarten	Classroom E Rural DD Preschool and Paid Daycare
total of 24 students	total of 11 students	total of 9 students	total of 11 students	total of 6 students
ages 3-5 years	ages 3-4 years	ages 2-5 years	ages 5-6 years	ages 15 mo. - 5 years
1 English-Only Regular Eduation Teacher	1 English-Only Special Education Teacher	1 English-Only Special Education Teacher		
1 Bilingual Special Education Teacher			1 Bilingual Special Education Teacher	1 Bilingual Special Education Teacher
1 Bilingual Educational Assistant	1 Bilingual Educational Assistant 1 English-Only Educational Assistant	1 Bilingual Educational Assistant 1 English-Only Educational Assistant	1 Bilingual Educational Assistant	N/A

Table 2

Percentages of Language Used by Teachers in Preschool Programs for Students Identified as Developmentally Delayed

Classroom Identified	Maintenance	Expansion	Nonverbal	Praise	Reprimand	Academic	Social
A*	24% English 22% Spanish	17% English 14% Spanish	15% English 22% Spanish	7% English 4% Spanish	0% English 0% Spanish	16% English 0% Spanish	19% English 38% Spanish
B	34% 12%	8% 1%	5% 31%	9%			
C	43% 4%	6% 2%	1% 42%	2%			
D	12% English 0% Spanish	14% English 0% Spanish	8% English 0% Spanish	28% English 0% Spanish	0% English 0% Spanish	22% English 0% Spanish	16% English 0% Spanish
E*	13% English 10% Spanish	20% English 22% Spanish	15% English 8% Spanish	22% English 14% Spanish	0% English 0% Spanish	29% English 31% Spanish	1% English 15% Spanish

* Bilingual Teacher

Table 3

Effective Aspects Observed in Monolingual English Teachers' Classrooms

Monolingual teachers:

1. observed and responded to cues that the student did not understand.
2. used ESL techniques to teach English terms/actions.
3. used social and academic language in English but were sensitive to the fact that the student might not understand certain "school" terms.
4. involved Spanish speaking paraprofessionals effectively in using primary language with children.
5. used hands-on activities, demonstrations, and guided instruction.
6. attempted to incorporate culturally relevant instruction.
7. had learned terms of endearment in Spanish and used them effectively with children.
8. had a genuine concern for the needs of culturally and linguistically diverse students with disabilities.

Table 4

Effective Aspects Observed in Bilingual Teachers' Classrooms

Bilingual teachers:

1. used their knowledge of Spanish to convey meaning, to teach new concepts, and to generally converse socially with children.
2. used social and academic Spanish in balanced doses.
3. used culturally appropriate language and terms of endearment when speaking with Hispanic children.
4. used knowledge of the culture and language in developing culturally sensitive and culturally appropriate instruction for Hispanic students.
5. encouraged other individuals involved in the classroom to speak the students' native language.
6. used hands-on activities, demonstrations, and guided instruction more frequently than whole group activities involving traditional teacher initiated and student response evaluation models of instruction.

Table 5

Recommendations for Monolingual English Teachers

1. School socialization should be less of a focus.
2. Questioning should not be the primary instructional method used.
3. More multicultural and culturally relevant activities which truly reflect the home and community should be included.
4. Spanish speaking paraprofessionals should be involved more effectively.
5. ESL strategies and a variety of methods should be used to convey meaning.
6. Care should be used with on-the-spot translation to ensure that appropriate meanings are conveyed.
7. More training in ESL and multicultural instruction is needed for working with CLDE students.

Table 6

Recommendations for Bilingual Teachers

1. Incorporate more academic Spanish in instruction and develop more Spanish language skills while introducing English as a second language.
2. Use some ESL strategies with Spanish dominant children.
3. Use less questioning and incorporate more wait-time.
4. Be careful not to use Spanish exclusively for reprimands and disciplinary actions.

Table 7

Recommendations for Involvement of Paraprofessionals in the Classroom

1. During teacher-centered activities, such as circle time, storytelling, or directed activities, paraprofessionals can be involved as leaders or co-leaders, especially when the paraprofessional speaks the native language of the students.
2. Paraprofessionals should have more opportunities to interact with children.
3. Paraprofessionals who speak the native language of the student should be encouraged to use positive reinforcement in the native language. A monolingual English speaking teacher can learn appropriate positive reinforcement terms from the paraprofessional.
4. The paraprofessional can assist the teacher in developing linguistically and culturally relevant instruction.

Figure Captions

Figure 1. Teaching behaviors demonstrated by monolingual English teachers.

Figure 2. Teaching behaviors demonstrated by bilingual teachers.

Collaborative Staff Development in Bilingual Special Education: Preliminary Results of a Five-Year Project

Shernaz B. Garcia, Ph.D., and Phyllis M. Robertson, Ph.D.,
The University of Texas at Austin

The shortage of trained, bilingual/bicultural personnel in special education poses a continuing challenge to the provision of appropriate services to exceptional students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. For this group of students individualized educational programs (IEPs) must address learning needs in ways that are responsive to disability, cultural characteristics, and language needs (Cloud, 1993; Garcia & Malkin, 1993; Ortiz & Wilkinson, 1991). Since school personnel involved in the IEP process do not necessarily possess the training and experience in all three areas, educational goals are more likely to be met through collaboration, with special educators and bilingual/ESL educators sharing their knowledge and experience related to disabilities and bilingualism, second language acquisition and cultural influences on learning, respectively; however, in many cases the current system has not facilitated or even provided opportunities for such collaboration.

Traditionally, categorically-funded programs have tended to function as separate, parallel entities despite the fact that some students are eligible for services from more than one program. When programs and personnel function as separate entities, systematic, ongoing opportunities for collaborative planning or integration of services are limited. Moreover, given differentiated roles and training, it is often difficult for personnel within each program to address the student's culture, language and disability in an integrated, holistic manner. For example, there is an increased risk that special education instruction will not necessarily reflect the adaptations which adequately address students' cultural characteristics and/or their linguistic needs. Conversely, special language programs may not appropriately modify dual language and/or ESL instruction to accommodate the disability.

Given the limited availability of pre service personnel preparation programs in bilingual and multicultural special education, the shortage of trained bilingual/multicultural special educators, and rapid growth in the CLD student population, there is a need to increase training opportunities at the preservice and inservice levels. Shared training experiences for bilingual/

BSL and special educators can potentially increase collaboration between program personnel, leading to improved coordinafion of services for exceptional language minority students. Such collaboration and the resulting increase in interactions and sharing of professional knowledge can, in turn, serve as vehicles for ongoing professional development. In an effort to address these training needs, the Bilingual Special Education faculty at the University of Texas at Austin have developed a team model for staff development which brings together individuals who serve exceptional language minority students in general and special education. In this paper, we present preliminary results of a five-year, federally-funded project designed to develop, field-test and disseminate training modules in bilingual special education through implementation of a collaborative training design.

Overview of the Special Project in Bilingual Special Education

The Special Project in Bilingual Special Education at The University of Texas at Austin is a five-year grant (1992-97) funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. The long-term goal of this project is to improve educational services for language minority students through training which addresses knowledge related to culture, language and disability, and prepares educators to better meet the needs of language minority students in general and special education. This goal is accomplished through the development and dissemination of training materials for personnel involved in staff development or preservice personnel preparation programs in bilingual education/ ESL and special education. Specific project activities include:

1. The development of training modules and materials for preservice and in service tralning programs which prepare educators to serve culturally and linguistically diverse students, with a focus on exceptional students;
2. Provision of three training-of-trainers ins fitutes each year for personnel who provide such training;
3. Dissemination of training materials through the training institutes as well as through replication of training by institute participants; and
4. Provision of technical assistance and follow-up support for project participants as they conduct training for their own agencies.

Development of Training Modules

Training topics and content reflect knowledge gathered and materials originally developed through projects funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, the Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs, and the Texas Education Agency. The Handicapped Minority Research Institute (1983-88) and the Innovative Approaches Research Project (1988-91), led to the

development of the Assessment and Intervention Model for Bilingual Exceptional Students (AIM for the BESt; Ortiz & Wilkinson, 1991). The Interagency Collaboration Project (Garcia, 1992; Office of Continuing Education and Bilingual Special Education Program, 1992), provided the first opportunity to pilot test the team training design and resulted in the development of training modules which addressed the various components of the AIM for the BES4 model. This model, along with the training materials, has been refined and expanded to include current and emerging research and practice, and to reflect the competencies addressed by the UT-Austin training programs in Bilingual Special Education and Special Education/ESL. Ten training modules will be developed over the five-year period, to address the following general topics: comprehensive service delivery system for language minority students, second language acquisition, cultural influences, prereferral intervention, appropriate assessment, and effective instructional practices. The relationship of all modules (those currently available as well as others to be developed during the remainder of the project) to relevant components of the Assessment and Intervention Model is presented in Figure 1.

Because the training institutes employ a training-of-trainers approach, the modules are designed to facilitate replication of training by project participants. Materials for each topic include handout- and transparency-masters as well as trainer notes, copies of articles that address the central concepts related to training, and a bibliography of additional readings. Institute participants receive a second set of handouts for their personal use during training.

Training-of-Trainers Institutes

The second major component of the project is the provision of training-of-trainers workshops which address the professional development needs of personnel who serve culturally and linguistically diverse students with disabilities. Three training institutes are offered each year over the duration of the five-year project. Year 1 activities were targeted toward Texas; training in subsequent years is designed to target the other 49 states in yearly cycles determined by the percentage of the language minority student enrollment within each state. Two states host conferences each year and a third conference, held in Austin, targets a national audience with priority given to registrations from states targeted that year.

The training institutes are designed to promote acquisition of specialized content by discipline and role over a three-day period, as well as to intermediate and state education agencies, and between general, bilingual/ESL and special education. Participants attend the institute as members of a team which includes personnel from administration, assessment, and instruction across the various programs. Teams can be representative of local district, intermediate or state education agencies, as well as institu-

tions of higher education. Enrollment for each institute is limited to 120 participants to allow for optima interaction and discussion within each workshop.

All participants attend an opening general session in which the Assessment and Intervention Model for Linguistically Different Students (Ortiz, 1992) is presented. This session is designed to develop a shared perspective among team members related to education of language minority students in general and special education, and provides a comprehensive overview of the training institute. Each participant then attends two all-day, concurrent workshops (one module per day) that are organized into administrative, instructional and assessment strands, followed by trainer meetings in which the discussion focuses on replication activities. Team members participate in the strand which best reflects their interests, roles and responsibilities. Though each individual receives in-depth training in only two areas, every effort is made to ensure that the team has collectively been trained on all topics on the program.

On the third day, team members are brought together for a three-hour strategic planning session. Institute trainers share strategies for on site replication of training and discuss available technical assistance options. Members of their respective training topics with their colleagues; the teams develop plans for disseminating workshop content at their local agencies, and provide feedback to project staff regarding their future training and technical assistance needs. Training institutes are evaluated by participants for their effectiveness in content delivery, organization, quality of training content and materials, and for the adequacy materials in facilitating replication and dissemination activities.

Follow-up and Technical Assistance

An important measure of the effectiveness of the training institutes is the extent to which participants are able to successfully replicate the training they receive from project staff. At 6-and 18-month intervals following each institute, participants receive questionnaires which elicit information about replication activities.

Project funding permits a limited amount of technical assistance support to project participants. These activities include telephone and mail correspondence, provision of additional training materials, including training videotapes, and *The Bilingual Special Education Perspective* newsletter to all project participants. On-site support and follow-up training are available at the expense of the requesting agency.

Project Accomplishments and Outcomes To-Date

During Fall 1994, the Special Project was beginning its third year of funding. By that time, a total of six training institutes had been implemented. Training activities during Year 1 targeted the state of Texas, with training

sites in Houston, Dallas and Austin. During Years 2-5, the scope of the project expanded to include other states with high concentrations of language minority students. During Year 2, statewide conferences were held in San Diego, CA and Wenatchee, WA. These state-wide conferences were implemented in collaboration with local sponsor~the California Department of Education and the San Diego County Office of Education co-sponsored the California Institute; the Wenatchee Institute was sponsored by the Washington State Office of the Superintendent of Public Instruction. The third conference (Austin, TX) included a national audience with priority given to participants from states targeted during Year 2.

During the first year, the model and training modules developed through previously funded projects were reviewed for their applicability, and appropriate content was updated and incorporated into the Special Project training. Additionally, support materials and trainer notes were developed to supplement existing handout and transparency masters. During the second year, two new modules were added to the training program comprehensive Service Delivery for Language Minorily Students, and Second Language Acquisition. As reflected in Table 1 modules to be added in subsequent years, include: Cultural Influences on Teaching and Learning, Effective Native Language Instruction, and Parent Involvement. Existing modules continue to be updated and revised in response to feedback from project participants.

Follow-up questionnaires administered six and eighteen months after each institute (Rounds 1 and 2, respectively) yielded information about the number of workshops participants had held and/or planned to hold, and solicited feedback concerning the adequacy of the training and materials provided through the Special Project. Participants from all six institutes have received Round 1 surveys; Year 1 participants from the Houston and Austin sites were also mailed the second administration of the questionnaire. Requests for technical assistance have been received primarily for clarification of module content, copies of training videos, and for project faculty and staff to participate in local replication activities.

Project Evaluation

The effectiveness of the Special Project in Bilingual Special Education to-date has been measured by the following: (a) number of individuals trained through the Special Project, (b) participant representation by role and agency affiliation, (c) effectiveness of the training institutes, (d) number of replications by trainers, and (e) effectiveness of replication efforts. Sources of information for these analyses included institute registration forms, participants' workshop evaluations, and follow-up questionnaires. Participant registration forms provided the counts for the number of persons trained, their position and agency affiliation. Workshop evaluation forms assessed participants' immediate responses to adequacy of the training

they received and the effectiveness of the training institutes. Follow-up questionnaires which have been returned provided information relative to replication activities.

Attendance, Agency Affiliation and Participation by Role

A total of 558 individuals have participated in the six training institutes described above. An analysis of their registration forms (see Table 1) revealed that the largest number of participants have been school district personnel (463 or 83% of total), followed by intermediaie education agencies (9.5%) and state departments of education (4.3%). When analyzed by role, as indicated by participants on their registration forms, it appears that the highest number of individuals were in instructional roles (234 or 41.9% of total). Administrators (e.g., supervisors, program coordinators or directors) were the second largest ou resent (32.1%), followed by assessment personnel (school psychologists and educational diagnosticians) who comprised or 15.9% of the total enrollment. Moreover, these categones reflect ersonnel assigned to general, bilingual/ESL and special education programs. While it is likely that some participants may have been classified incorrectly (given that these data reflect interpretation of descriptions provided by participants, and some individuals designated more than one job title), these data do suggest that the project has been successful in reaching a cross-section of individuals involved in the education of language minority students in general and special education. Though the U.S. Office of Civil Rights was not originally designated as a target group, three attorneys have completed three-day training-of-trainers institutes.

Participant Evaluation of Training Institutes

On the final day of each institute, participants were asked to complete an evaluation form rating the training institute in its entirety, including the opening session, two in-depth training workshops, and the strategic planning session held on the third day. Evaluation forms were comprised of two sections: in the first, respondents were asked to evaluate the institute on five items, using a 5-point scale; the second section included open-ended questions related to the strengths of the institute training, and recommendations for improvement.

Data from the six institutes (see Table 2) revealed that respondents found the workshop content to be transferable to their work settings, and that presentations were clear and well-organized. In general, participants attending the institutes in Dallas, TX and San Diego, CA responded with lower ratings than did participants at the other four workshops. In response to open-ended questions, suggestions for improvement reflected the need for additional training time, differentiated training based on participants' level of prior knowledge, and more information relative to the implementation of future training. Finally, participants in California often commented

that the language of the training materials needed to be modified to re ect current terminology used in their state.

Results of Replication Activities

Information about replication efforts was obtained from the follow-up questionnaires, in which participants responded to selected items using a 5-point rating-scale as well as open-ended questions. The latter tapped participants' perceptions of the most beneficial aspects of the training and the effectiveness of the team training design, as well as suggestions for future improvement of the institute and materials. In addition, participants were asked to discuss any challenges they had encountered in planning and implementing replication training. A summary of available follow-up data is presented in Tables 3 and 4. Two rounds of data have been gathered from participants attending institutes in Houston, TX and Austin, TX during 1993. One round of data is available from participants attending institutes in Austin, TX and San Diego, CA during 1994. Questionnaires are expected to continue to arrive over an extended period of time, and it is anticipated that the final response rate for these training sites will be significantly higher than reflected in Table 3.

Return rates for the follow-up surveys have averaged 29 percent, ranging from 18 to 35 percent of the number of participants who attended each institute (see Table 3). Of 121 individuals who responded to Round 1, sixty-nine (or 57%) reported that they had replicated training, with a total of 178 workshops either planned or implemented by this group; an additional 49 replications were reported by Round 2 respondents. Two patterns were noted related to the number of replications reported: (a) the percentage of participants replicating training increased with each successive conference, and (b) the percentage of replication was higher on the first administration of the questionnaire (Round 1) than on the second (Round 2). Most replicators reported that they had held multiple training sessions and collectively, 227 workshops were reported across the two administrations of the questionnaire.

Participants' responses related to the effectiveness of the training and materials provided by the Special Project indicated high levels of satisfaction with their expenence (see Table 4). The majority felt that the training they had received adequately prepared them to conduct their own workshops. They were particularly positive about the effectiveness of the materials they had received; mean ratings on these items ranged from 3.8 to 4 8 (on a 5-point scale; 1 = low, 5 = high). Respondent ratings on the effectiveness of matenals did not vary significantly between the two administrations of the questionnaire. Respondents also reported receiving positive evaluations of the training they had provided (means ranged from 3.7 to 4.4). However, they tended to rate their perceptions of their own effectiveness somewhat lower (means ranging from 3.0 to 4.3). Most respondents

were interested in receiving additional training from the Special Project in Bilingual Special Education.

Participants' responses to open-ended questions included in the questionnaire have provided project staff with useful information for planning future conferences. When asked what aspects of the training were most beneficial, respondents most frequently mentioned the full-day workshops, materials, and the availability of videotapes. Suggestions for improvement included allowing more time for team planning/sharing, providing outlines/summaries of the content to participants in advance of the institute, and the identification of appropriate audiences. Respondents felt that the content was far too advanced for novices, but many participants mentioned that the material was not new to them. When asked specifically for suggestions on improving training materials, participants, for the most part, responded that the materials were excellent. They did suggest including more information in the training manuals, particularly with respect to conducting hands-on activities.

When asked to identify challenges they had faced in planning and executing training, respondents most frequently cited time constraints as the major issue. Others mentioned that inservice training schedules were often set far in advance and offered little flexibility. Teachers stated that their job responsibilities did not typically include the provision of training making it difficult to manage. Other challenges included difficulty in involving various departments (i.e., special education and bilingual education), lack of administrative support, lack of teachers' motivation to change, and the need for more follow-up and technical assistance.

Respondents generally felt that the team model worked well and provided the opportunity to incorporate many different perspectives. Moreover, respondents mentioned that working as a team allowed them to reach out to multiple audiences. Several identified the need for more overlap in training provided to individual members; they suggested that it would be more effective for team members to attend the same full-day sessions, rather than spread team members across all workshops, as is the current practice. Respondents also mentioned that time constraints, staff shortages, and attrition often negatively impacted their ability to work as a team.

Discussion

Overall, the Special Project has made considerable progress toward achieving its objectives during its first two years of implementation. The preliminary data presented above suggest that the Special Project in Bilingual Special Education has been successful in reaching and bringing together a large number and broad range of professionals who serve CLD students in general and special education. Feedback from these individuals has highlighted the importance of and need for collaboration in meeting students' needs. The collaborative training model used by the Special Project

provided the framework for professionals from varied backgrounds and programs to engage in cooperative planning and created opportunities for them to share their respective knowledge and expertise with each other, thereby facilitating the exchange of information across the areas of general education, bilingual education/ESL and special education. This collaboration has also been instrumental in supporting the dissemination of the training content, since team members are able to provide each other with on going support and to share the responsibility for replication across multiple audiences at the localAevel.

A second accomplishment of the project is the dissemination of training materials and content to a much larger and broader audience than would have been possible for project trainers to reach alone. Given the shortage of trained personnel and the limited number of training programs available across the nation, the Special Project reflects an effort to increase the number of trainers locally available to prepare bilingual special education and related program personnel. Furthermore, local trainers who are available on an ongoin basis and who can serve as peer coaches (Showers, 1984) are more likely to successfully strategies and services for language minority students, as compared with more traditional, intermittent training provided by outside experts/consultants (Bush, 1984, cited in Sleeter, 1992). Team members have also been able to evaluate current levels of service provided to CLD students with disabilities, and to make appropriate modifications. Even though the number of applications reported response rate to the follow-up questionnaires has been low, the number of replications reported by this small group has been encouraging.

The development and continued refinement of training modules which support institute activities is another important outcome of the project. These materials are designed to facilitate dissemination of training and represent a compilation of current research and effective practices in the targeted areas. Participants' comments have served not only to reinforce the effectiveness of the materials but also to identify areas for further improvement, which will guide future development activities. Current modifications include the refinement of existing trainer notes, the addition of activity guides, and the designation of specific handouts for 1-hour overview sessions within each workshop module.

The Training-of-Trainers Format

Successful implementation of a training-of-trainers institute presumes that participants will depart with sufficient knowledge related to the training content to enable them to impart this training to others. An equally important consideration is the effective delivery of this content. Because the relatively short, 3-day training institute implemented by the Special Project could not reasonably accomplish both objectives, emphasis was placed on identifying participants who were already in staff development-related roles. An

additional benefit of this approach was that individuals could more easily incorporate replication activities into their routine roles and responsibilities. Variations in the level of replication activity across the two years of the project tend to partially reflect this situation. During the first year of implementation, enrollment in the institute was open to any interested team which applied for training. It is likely that individuals who participated may not have held responsibility for staff development which may have, in turn, made it more difficult for them to assume replication efforts in addition to their regular duties. Moreover, some participants raised questions about their ability to replicate training due to their limited knowledge and experience related to language minority students. Consequently, two significant changes were introduced during the second year, related to the training design and selection of potential trainers. First, the training institute was redesigned to accommodate two different audiences: (a) individuals with little or no prior training related to the topics, and (b) those who had expressed an interest in becoming trainers who were more likely to be at intermediate-to-advanced levels of knowledge and to have related responsibilities for student development. Second, formal procedures were established to obtain administrative support for those team members who were registered trainers, so that trainers would have the necessary systemic commitment to replicate training at their local sites. Only registered trainers received the entire set of training materials (handout and transparency masters, and trainer notes) for workshops they attended and planned to replicate. As can be seen in Table 3, Phough the number of respondents for the 1994 institutes was lower, reflecting fewer trainers per institute, the proportionate number of replications reported was much higher. Given the preliminary and incomplete nature of these data, however, it is premature to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of these changes until the long-term data are gathered and analyzed.

The ultimate purpose of the Special Project is to have a positive influence on services provided language minority students in general and special education, through effective inservice and pre service training for professionals involved in the implementation of these programs. Though impact on students could not be incorporated as a component of the evaluation design due to limited resources, preliminary results indicate that the training institutes have been effective in reaching professionals who are responsible for providing staff development and/or technical support to personnel who serve this student population to date, the training institute participants have been primarily professionals at the local, intermediate and state agency levels. It is anticipated that future dissemination activities will specifically target faculty in higher education who are involved in teacher preparation in bilingual ESL and special education, and who may be interested in developing training programs in bilingual special education and special education/ESL. In addition, future efforts are also likel to explore

(a) ways to expand technical support to participants, (b) opportunities to bring participants back for follow-up support an training in new modules developed in subsequent years, and (c) further refinement of training content.

In conclusion, projections for the remainder of the Special Project in Bilingual Special Education are positive. Formal and informal feedback suggest that the project is meeting an established need to provide training in bilingual special education. Though the number of participants trained is very limited in comparison to numbers of trained personnel needed to serve exceptional language minonty students, the use of the training-of-trainers approach has increased our audience to recipients of training replicated by institute participants. Moreover, by bringing together professionals across special education, general education and bilingual education/ESL, the Special Project attempts to reduce traditional barriers to collaboration between these programs, to strengthen existing relationships and build new bridges that will integrate services for language minonty students with disabilines so that their educational experiences can be truly inclusive.

References

Cloud, N. (1993). Language, culture and disability: Implications for instruction and teacher preparation. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 16*, 60-72

Garcia, S. B. (1992, Fall/Winter). A model for staff development in Bilingual Special Education. *The Bilingual Special Education Perspective, 12*, 1, 3-6.

Garcia, S. B., & Malkin, D. H. (1993). Toward defining programs and services for culturally and linguistically diverse learners in special education. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 26*, 52-58.

Hord, S. (1992). *Facilitative leadership: The imperative for change*. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

Office of Continuing Education, and Bilingual Special Education Program. (1992). *Interagency Collaboration Project: Final Report*. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, College of Education.

Ortiz, A. (1992, March). *Assessment and intervention model for linguistically different students*. Austin, TX: The University of Texas, College of Education.

Ortiz, A. A., & Wilkinson, C. Y. (1991). Assessment and intervention model for the bilingual exceptional student. *Teacher Education and Special Education, 14*, 35-42.

Showers, B. (1984). *Peer coaching: A strategy for facilitating transfer of training*. Eugene, OR: Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Sleeter, C. (1992). *Keepers of the American dream: A study of staff development and multicultural education*. Bristol, PA: The Falmer Press.

Table 1

Distribution of Participants in Training Institutes by Agency Affiliation and Role

	Number (%) of Training Institute Participants by Role[a]											
	Administration		Instruction		Assessment		Speech/ Language		Other		Total[b]	
Agency Affiliation	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	n	(%)	N	(%)
School District	144	(260)	194	(35)	76	(14)	39	(7)	10	(2)	463	(83)
Intermediate Agency	21	(4)	18	(3)	11	(2)	1	(<1)	2	(<1)	53	(10)
Stte Education Agency	12	(2)	10	(2)	2	(<1)					24	(4)
Higher Education	2	(<1)	12	(2)					1	(<1)	15	(3)
U.S. Office of Civil Rights									3	(<1)	3	(<1)
Total[b]	179	(32)	234	(42)	89	(16)	40	(7)	16	(3)	558	(100)

[a]Numbers within each role include representatives from general education, special education, and bilingual education/ESL.
[b]Totals may not add due to rounding.

Table 2

Mean Ratings for Participant Evaluations of Overall Training Institute Effectiveness by Training Site

Evaluation Questions	Location and Year of Training Institutes					
	Houston TX, 1993 n=82	Dallas TX, 1993 n=15	Austin, TX, 1993 n=67	Austin, TX, 1994 n=75	San Diego CA, 1994 n=52	Wenatchee, WA 1994 n=82
1. How relevant was the content?	4.7	4.0	4.4	4.6	3.4	4.7
2. How transferable was the content to your work setting?	4.5	3.6	4.6	4.2	3.1	4.3
3. How organized were the presentations?	4.8	4.8	4.6	4.4	3.2	4.8
4. How clear were the presentations?	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.3	3.4	4.7
5. How effective was the training institute overall?	4.6	3.0	4.4	4.4	3.3	4.6

[a]The values on the scale for this adrninistration of the evaluation were inverted. The data were converted to ensure consistency with other evaluations and to permit comparisons.

[b]Based on a five-point scale: 1 = insignificantly, 2 = slightly, 3 = moderately, 4 = very, 5=extremely.

Table 3

Results of Follow-up Surveys of Local Replications by Institute and Administration[a]

	# of Participating Trainers	6-Month Follow-up Number (%) of respondents		Number (%) of respondents who replicated training[b]		Reported number of workshops held and/or planned[c]
Training Institute	N	n	(%)	n	(%)	f
Houston, 1993	133	43	(32)	11	(26)	26
Austin, 1993	131	46	(35)	29	(64)	72
Austin, 1994	74	17	(23)	14	(82)	48
San Diego, 1994	83	15	(18)	15	(100)	32
Total	421	121	(29)	69	(57)	178
		18-Month Follow-up				
Training Institute	N	n	(%)	n	(%)	f
Houston, 1993	133	20	(15)	2	(10)	3
Austin, 1993	131	37	(28)	16	(44)	46
Total	264	57	(22)	18	(32)	49

[a]As of November, 1994.
[b]Numbers and percentages in this column are based on the number of respondents.
[c]The number of workshops exceeds the number of respondents as several individuals conducted multiple sessions.

Table 4

Mean Responses to Follow-Up Questionnaire Items by Institute and Administration

	Houston 1993 (N = 133)		Austin 1993 (N = 131)		Austin 1994 (N = 74)	San Diego 1994 (N = 83)
Questionnaire Items	Round 1[a]	Round 2[a]	Round 1	Round 2	Round 1	Round 1
1. Adequacy of the training in preparing you to train.	4.1[b]	3.8	4.0	4.0	4.3	3.9
2. Effectiveness of the preparedmaterials.	4.5	4.5	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.4
3. Evaluational feedback you received about training content.	4.1	3.7	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.4
4. Your perception of the effectiveness of your training.	4.2	3.0	3.9	4.1	4.1	4.3
5. Interest in receiving more training.	4.1	4.3	4.4	4.0	4.8	4.2

[a]Round 1 = 6 months post-institute; Round 2=18 months post-institute.

[b]Based on a 5-point scale: 1 = insignificantly; 2 = slightly; 3 = moderately; 4 = very; 5 = extremely.

Footnotes

[1]The Special Project in Bilingual Special Education and the activities described herein are funded by the U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (grant number H029K2000293). The opinions expressed in this article do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement should be inferred.

ASSESSMENT AND INTERVENTION MODEL FOR LINGUISTICALLY DIFFERENT STUDENTS[1]	TRAINING MODULES												
	Comprehensive Service Delivery	Second Language Acquisition	Cultural Influences on Teaching/Learning	Procedural Intervention	Using Teacher Assistance Teams	Language Assessment	Non-Biased Assessment	Effective Instruction Native Language	Effective Instruction English as a 2nd Lang.	Parent Involvement	In preparation or to be developed
STEP 1—An accepting and supportive school environment is established which reflects a philosophy that all students can learn.	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓	✓	
STEP 2—The classroom teacher uses instructional strategies known to be effective for linguistically different students.	✓	✓	✓	✓				✓	✓		
STEP 3—When a student experiences difficulty, the teacher attempts to resolve the difficulty and validates the problem.	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓	✓	
STEP 4—If the problem is not resolved, support systems other than special education are readily available.	✓			✓	✓					✓	
STEP 5—If the problem is not resolved through the consultation/team process, a special education referral is initiated.	✓			✓	✓						
STEP 6—A child study team convenes to determine whether the student should be referred for a comprehensive evaluation.	✓	✓	✓			✓	✓			✓	
STEP 7—Assessment personnel incorporate informal and/or curriculum-based assessments in the comprehensive individual assessment.	✓					✓	✓				
STEP 8—If the student is eligible for special education, special educators use instructional strategies known to be effective for language minority students.	✓	✓	✓					✓	✓	✓	

[1] This 8-step model is the current, revised version of the original AIM for the BEST model (Ortiz & Wilkinson, 1991).

Figure Caption

Figure 1. Relationship of the training modules to the steps in the assessment and intervention model.

What Do Reform and Restructuring Mean for Culturally Diverse Exceptional Learners?

Festus E. Obiakor, Ph.D, Emporia State University
Cheryl Utley, Ph.D., Juniper Gardens Children's Project, The University of Kansas

Abstract

Recent reform and restructuring programs in education have emphasized excellence and quality. Presumably, these programs have been instituted to change the "Nation at Risk" to the "Nation of Students." Though these programs appear visionary, their fundamental concepts highlight "old" ideas based on a "puritanic" perfect society. When efforts turn to changing educational systems, too often little attention is focused on equity in testing, placement, and instructional policies. For culturally diverse students with exceptionalities, present reform and restructuring programs may create more problems than they can solve unless common sense approaches to assessment, identification, and instruction are incorporated. The impact of general and special education reform and restructuring programs on culturally diverse learners is discussed in this paper. Embedded in this discussion are strategies for general and special educators, policy makers, and administrators to use in driving educational practice from mediocrity to world-class superiority.

Change appears to be an inevitable consequence of the passage of time. Some changes result in progressive outcomes, some produce retrogressive results, and some generate "mixed baggages." Often, the confusing consequences lead to tremendous debates among general and special educators. For example, noncategorical approaches changed the way special education was delivered and the logic, need, and value of this novel approach were vigorously debated during the early to middle 1970s after traditional approaches were questioned with the publication in 1968 of Lloyd Dunn's famous article "Special Education for the Mildly Retarded: Is Much of It Justifiable?" During this time, constructs and terms such as mainstreaming and zero reject became the common place technical jargon of the day. Approximately two decades earlier, the Russians launched Sputnik and the United States responded by reorienting its educational programs to emphasize math and the hard sciences. Committees were formed to restructure and reform the system and educators and community leaders such as the School Mathematic Study Group developed math programs

to insure that the United States could compete with the challenges put forth by Russia (Allen, Douglas, Richmond, Rickart, Swain, & Walker, 1961). Change led to calls for change that led to calls for more change. This is the educational way.

Today, the society faces a greater challenge (i.e., how to best empower each person, irrespective of race, color, gender, and linguistic difference) to maximize his/her potential. Put another way, the challenge for educational reformers is how best to insure that all members of society have equal access to a quality education, thereby insuring "quality" and "equity" and the individual and collective growth of our uniquely diverse society (American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, 1987, 1994; Artiles & Trent, 1994; Ford & Obiakor, 1995; Ford, Obiakor, & Patton, 1995; Goodlad & Lovitt, 1993; Obiakor, Algozzine & Ford, 1993, 1994; Samuelson & Obiakor, 1995; Trent, 1992, 1995; Wald, 1996). For it is the twin threads "equity" and "quality" that were the foundation of efforts to transform special education in the 1970s and underlie much of the controversy surrounding the current restructuring and reform movement. In order for general and special education to come to terms with inclusion, multiculturalism, collaboration, consultation, cooperation, partnership, teamwork, and empowerment, all members of society must have equal access to a quality education. In this decade, these issues have become driving forces for change and reform. Cuban (1990) decried the repetitive nature of reforms and how educational programs have fallen prey to them. In the same dimension, Kauffman and Hallahan (1995), Ford and Obiakor (1995), and Trent (1992) denounced the lack of a common-sense approach to general and special education reforms. The fact that reformers have not discussed the impact of restructuring general and special education on culturally diverse learners leads the present authors to question whether the current reform is not somewhat of a "rat race" with reformers hurriedly scurrying about without taking the necessary time to carefully think precisely how to restructure general and special education to responsibly provide for the needs of this group of learners.

Special Education Reforms and the Band-Aid Phenomenon

As stated previously, change appears to be an inevitable consequence of time. The question that educational reformers must struggle with is, Can real progress be made in special education without at least modifying the entrenched culture of traditional Eurocentric educational pedagogy? For example, it is common knowledge that a myriad of legislative mandates to reform and restructure special education practices has been promulgated for *all* students' benefits. For instance, the 1964 Civil Rights Act, the 1973 Section 504 of the Vocational Rehabilitation Act, the 1975 Education of All Handicapped Children Act, the 1990 Americans with Disabilities Act, the 1990 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act, and the 1994 Goal 2000

Educate America Act have been well-meaning societal efforts to assist *all* students in maximizing their full potential. Ironically, for culturally different students, these legislative efforts appear to have impacted only slightly on the traditional Eurocentric educational system. For all practical purposes, this traditional system has not been modified sufficiently to accommodate culturally diverse learners as a result of these initiatives.

Even though the aforementioned laws have promoted nondiscriminatory educational services and practices, the present state of affairs reveals that culturally diverse learners are still confronted with multidimensional problems. Artiles and Trent (1994), and Ford and Obiakor (1995) reiterated that culturally diverse learners remain disproportionately represented in special education programs for students with cognitive and/or behavioral difficulties while having limited access to services for learners with gifts and talents. In addition, many administrators, educators, and service providers who design and implement services for culturally diverse youth appear unprepared or ill-prepared to provide these services for this population. It appears that many institutions of higher education are meeting only the letter, but not the spirit of the law. Rarely do teacher preparation programs institute innovative approaches to identification, assessment, and instruction that address the multidimensional needs of culturally diverse learners. In fact, today much of the optimism, created by the 1954 Brown vs. Topeka Board of Education case, that systemic exclusion and inequitable separate educational policies and programs would not be "legally" condoned appears to have vanished. The "savage inequalities" in programmatic funding for some segments of society are all too pervasive for many learners with diverse backgrounds and needs (Kozol, 1992).

Visionary Versus Illusory Reforms

Traditionally, reform and restructuring programs are designed supposedly to reach *all* students. The critical question is, What kind of general and special education reform and restructuring program will best meet the needs of learners who are at-risk of misidentification, misassessment, mislabeling, and misinstruction? Laws have been promulgated and court battles have been fought; yet, "the more things change the more they remain the same." To positively impact the advancement of culturally diverse learners, special education reform and change must be meaningful and goal-oriented. The "rat-race" for reforms may not be the answer because some reforms lack the vision and common sense. For instance, the U.S. Department of Education (1991), in its book, *American 2000: An education strategy* mapped out six national education goals "to jump start a new generation of American schools, transforming a 'Nation at Risk' into a 'Nation of Students'" (p. 59). According to the U.S. Department of Education under the auspices of former President George Bush, by the beginning of the 21st century:

1. All children in America will start school ready to learn.
2. The high school graduation rate will increase to at least 90 percent.
3. American students will leave grades four, eight, and twelve having demonstrated competency in challenging subject matter including English, mathematics, science, history, and geography; and every school in America will ensure that all students learn to use their minds well, so they may be prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning, and productive employment in our modern economy.
4. U.S. students will be first in the world in science and mathematics achievement.
5. Every adult American will be literate and will possess the knowledge and skills necessary to compete in a global economy and exercise the rights and responsibilities of good citizenship.
6. Every school in America will be free of drugs and violence and will offer disciplined environment conducive to learning. (p. 3)

The "American 2000" program was embraced and expanded by President Bill Clinton when he signed The "Goals 2000" Educate America Act (U.S. Department of Education, 1994). Apparently, this later law incorporated many major ingredients of the "America 2000" program. With all its good intentions, the outcomes of "America 2000" programs remain illusive and unrealized because it (a) relied heavily on national testing, (b) irrationally advocated parental choice, (c) over-generalized in its use of "all" and "every," and (d) ill-defined accountability to suit "smart" students, "good" schools, and students from "good" socio-economic backgrounds. At present, the pendulum has swung toward the conservative trend on national policies and there appears to be (a) budgetary constraints for poverty programs, (b) renewed emphasis on testing, parental choice, and accountability at all educational levels, and (c) serious attacks on compensatory education programs. Many inner-city schools are ear-marked as "poor" and schools in the suburbs are labeled as "rich" schools while neglecting savage inequalities in funding and outcomes (Kozol, 1992). There appears to be myths of socio-economic dissonance and illusory correlations between poverty and "poor" intelligence, "poor" self-concept, and "poor" ability to succeed in school. The question is, How prepared are these "rich" schools to respond to the "dreaded" issue of cultural diversity of African-American parents and students? Not long ago, Kaplan (1991) reacted:

> As an educational strategy, America 2000 is a plan for middle class America, where pride in academic achievement still runs high most of the time and most people like their community's schools. That some of these schools are performing below expectation is lamen-

> table, but jettisoning them in order to conform to a market-driven, private school-oriented vision of schooling in a responsible democratic society is palpable nonsense, and very dangerous. (p. 36)

It appears that the institution of the 1990 Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) reilluminated many fundamental concepts of special education. The public was reassured of (a) adequate identification, (b) nondiscriminatory multidisciplinary assessment, (c) placement in the least restrictive environment, (d) confidentiality of information, (e) parental consent, (f) procedural safeguards, and (g) individualized educational programming. The general consensus was that old mistakes would never be repeated. About eight years later, the old troublesome debates continue to rage. The question continues to be, Can present general and special education reform programs that rely heavily on tests address the needs of culturally diverse and other at-risk youngsters who frequently fall between the cracks? Clearly, the answer is no! As long as assessment is primarily carried out by tests that are biased and therefore invalid, culturally diverse exceptional learners will continue to be at risk of misidentification, misassessment, miscategorization, and misinstruction. Only when assessment is truly authentic (i.e.,direct observation of samples of behavior) will it assist practitioners in designing and planning interventions that address diverse students' unique learning needs. Further, many culturally diverse students are sometimes made to be "invisible" and labeled as "incapable students" by poorly prepared teachers, and even some experienced teachers. Their educational programs are rarely modified to address their multidimensional needs. These practices place many of them in at-risk positions in classrooms, schools, and communities. The reasons are simple. Race continues to matter in schools and communities (Bell, 1992; Brown, 1994; Spring 1995; Weis & Fine, 1993; West 1993), and many teacher education programs continue to be tied to the apron strings of traditional Eurocentric educational programs (Diaz 1992; Dilworth, 1992; Gollnick & Chinn, 1994; Grant & Gomez, 1996; Obiakor, 1993, 1994, 1995; Obiakor, Weaver, & Hoshino, 1996; Siccone, 1995; Sleeter, 1992).

Reforming Teacher Preparation Programs

In this day and age, the reality of multiculturalism is apparent. Mendenhall (1991) indicated that "the more everyone in a group knows and understands the same set of social values, the less interpersonal problems will result between group members" (p. D7). While acknowledging that multiculturalism will foster harmonious relationships, he noted that "in many parts of the United States it is a reality—and it is predicted that by the year 2010 multiculturalism will be reality for the entire American work place" (p. D7). The question is, How prepared are America's teacher preparation programs to modify their programs to accommodate culturally diverse learn-

ers? Price (1991) argued that "the blame for balkanization rests more with those who have the power to include but won't and less with those on the outside who are barred entry" (p. 8). Put another way, teacher preparation programs have important roles to play to enhance the workability of reform programs.

Unfortunately, however many teacher preparation programs have consistently relied on test scores made in the Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT), the American College Test (ACT), and the PreProfessional Skills Test (PPST) for admission. In addition, before graduation, most States require students to have passing scores in the National Teacher Examination (NTE) for a gainful employment. Just as tests create problems for students in public school programs, these requirements create tremendous problems for many culturally diverse student-teachers (Obiakor, 1993, 1994; Obiakor & Ford, 1995). Many of these students get frustrated and drop out of teacher preparation programs — this leads to an apparent lack of minority teachers in special education programs that traditionally have many minority students. For instance, the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (1987) reported that the number of African-Americans in teacher preparation is small when compared to the number of African-American group children in public schools — African Americans represent about 16.2% of the children in public schools, but only about 6.2% of the teachers. Even with this glaringly sad note, many teacher preparation programs continue to:

1. Rely on entry and exit tests that lack reliability and validity (e.g., ACT, SAT, PPST, and NTE Exams). Even when these tests produce consistent results, they often fail to measure what they need to measure (i.e., how an individual can graduate and become an effective teacher).
2. Focus on competition rather than cooperative problem solving techniques that most nonwhite cultures adopt.
3. Engage in the half-hearted recruitment, retention, and graduation of multicultural students to respond to current demographic changes in schools and society.
4. Fail to make frantic efforts to recruit, retain, and promote multicultural faculty and staff who can be role models for both White and minority students.
5. Lag behind in infusing multicultural education to respond to current demographic changes in schools and society.

It is reasonable to argue that poorly prepared teachers teach poorly. When culturally diverse students are taught by teachers who do not understand their cultures, symbols, or values, the whole concept of individualized educational programming fails. Reforming and restructuring ought to be encouraged when they respond to individual differences and demographic changes. For instance, Thomas and Alawiye (1990) noted the

nonrepresentation of achievements of African-American members of the society in the literature when they wrote:

> Our examination of selected elementary textbooks, grades 1 to 6 disclosed that the historical background and cultural contributions of slaves in early America are ignored. In particular, the art, architecture, literature, and music contributed by West Africans during their enslavement in the American South are excluded. (p.20)

The implication of Thomas and Alawiye's discovery is that many instructional programs have failed to value and utilize historical backgrounds, cultural beliefs, language and symbols, and behavioral patterns of culturally diverse learners (Banks, 1991; Gay, 1981; Obiakor, Algozzine, & Ford, 1993, 1994). In general, the complex web of informal Eurocentric processes has tended to decrease academic opportunities, choices, and achievements for culturally diverse exceptional learners (Ewing, 1995; Ford, Obiakor, & Patton, 1995). As Ewing observed, culturally insensitive educational practices can affect students' motivation to learn, alter how they respond to instruction, and influence whether they respect and trust themselves, their peers, teachers, and administrators. Apparently, the cycle of low performance is perpetuated by poorly prepared teachers who lack the cultural knowledge of how to inspire these students to excel.

Where Do We Go From Here?

As advances are made into the 21st century, schools and professionals must create genuine school/parent/community partnerships. Schools and professionals can make a difference, but they must be equipped and prepared with the necessary tools and knowledge. The present delivery systems must be reworked, and reform and restructuring movements must be thoughtfully followed. If general and special educators are serious about responding to the needs of culturally diverse learners as they undertake to design and implement inclusionary educational reform, they must continue to ask the following intriguing questions:

1. Why is a particular reform being promulgated today and what are bedrock reasons for promoting the policy?
2. How precisely will these reform measures impact African-American and other culturally diverse learners?
3. When will the reform program begin in the earnest?
4. Where will the funding of the program come from?
5. What particular steps will be followed to imitate or continue program stability?

In addition, reform and restructuring programs must be designed to:

1. Ensure that adequate knowledge of multiculturalism is included in professional standards.

2. Provide incentives for recruiting and retaining cultural diverse general and special educators and service providers from early childhood through university levels.
3. Focus on solutions to educational problems and not on the politics of problems (e.g., the politics of inclusionary practices have superseded their benefits in the literature).
4. Address issues of equity and excellence in the education of students by imitating inclusive policies rather than exclusive ones. The more people have a stake in policies, the more they partake in them.
5. Provide opportunities for creating a comprehensive support model that empowers *all* students, *all* parents, *all* schools, and *all* communities.

Teacher preparation programs must be proactive in current reforming and restructuring movements. It is apparent that new ways of identification, assessment, placement, and instruction must be presented to future teachers. According to Obiakor, Prater, and Utley (1996), teacher preparation courses must incorporate issues related to:

1. Demographic changes, cultural relativism, and cultural patterns.
2. Paradigm and power shifts and impact on schools and society.
3. Nondiscriminatory assessment and instruction.
4. The power of words (e.g., Psycho-educational constructs, models, and meanings).
5. Concept of intra- and inter-individual differences.
6. Ethics in psychology and education.
7. Role information exchange (e.g., News media, books, and textbooks).

In addition to challenging traditional thinking, efforts must be made to institute innovative initiatives (e.g., the Project Interface of the University of Arizona, Project Partnership of Emporia State University, "Each One Reach One" Project of the University of Tennessee at Chattanooga, Bilingual Special Education Training Project of the University of Texas at Austin, and "Reach One Male Educator" Project of Henderson State University at Arkadelphia, Arkansas) that have helped preservice students to learn new methods of maximizing the full potential of atypical learners. These initiatives deserve cooperative, collaborative, and consultative shifts by different powers involved in the education of multicultural learners and teachers.

Conclusions

In this paper, we have explored the impact of general and special education reform and restructuring programs on culturally diverse exceptional learners. We support current reform and restructuring efforts but call for a

careful analysis of these programs before they are accepted. Artiles and Trent (1994) warned that policy makers and policy implementers must examine problems in their complexity and test solutions to avoid historical mistakes of the past. Based on this premise, we concur that general and special educators must prepare for shifts in power and paradigm like those that will occur when general and special educators begin to share the responsibility to educate all students. Clearly, for educators to anticipate the future, they must start very early to search for "new" meaning like the partnership that needs to occur between general and special educators, paraprofessionals and parents.

Reform and restructuring programs in general and special education call for dialogue, collaboration, consultation, cooperation, and partnership. Responsible reform programs must be strategically visionary and not illusory — they must selflessly empower *all* students, *all* parents, *all* schools, and *all* communities to maximize their growth potential. When properly examined, reform and restructuring programs for culturally diverse learners will lead not to a rat race for excellence, but to a responsible step-wise plan for achieving excellence in general and special education.

We are convinced that no reform program can answer all general and special education questions for culturally diverse learners. The answer lies within the realistic intent of educational programs to attack inequities through practical implementation of multiculturalism and multiethnicity in assessment, placement, categorization, and instructional policies. There is an absolute need for more *soul* in teacher preparation programs so that educators avoid meeting only the letter of the law, but instead become authentically engaged in the spirit of teaching. Challenges that face our reform programs today reflect challenges that will face our public schools in the 21st century. These challenges will continue as long as general and special education programs are not required to respond to the needs of *all* segments of a changing society.

References

Ewing, N. J. (1995). Restructured teacher education for inclusiveness: A dream deferred for African American children. In B. A. Ford, F. E. Obiakor, & J. M. Patton (Eds.), *Effective education of African American exceptional learners: New perspectives* (pp.189-207). Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Ford, B. A., & Obiakor, F. E. (1995, February). What's next for African-American exceptional learners. *CEC Today, 1*, 12.

Ford, B. A., & Obiakor, F. E., & Patton, J. M. (1995). *Effective education of African American exceptional learners: New perspectives*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Gay, G. (1981). Interactions in the culturally pluralistic classroom. In J. A. Banks (Ed.), *Education in the 80's: Multiethnic education*. Washington, DC: National Education Association.

Gollnick, D. M., & Chinn, P. C. (1994). *Multicultural education in a pluralistic society* (4th ed.). New York: Merrill.

Goodlad, J. I., & Lovitt, T. C. (1993). *Integrating general and special education*. New York: Merrill.

Grant, C. A., & Gomez, M. L. (1996). *Making schooling multicultural: Campus and classroom*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Kaplan, G. R. (1991, May 22). Watch out for America 2000: It really is a crusade. *Education Week*, pp. 26, 37.

Kauffman, J. M., & Hallahan, D. P. (1995). *The illusion of full inclusion: A comprehensive critique of a current special education bandwagon*. Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Kozol, J. (1992). *Savage inequalities: Children in American schools*. New York: Harper Perennial.

Mendenhall, M. (1991, October 3). "Diversity" more than a buzzword for workplace. *The Chattanooga Times*, p. 27.

Obiakor, F. E. (1993). Multiculturalism: Critical issue facing teacher education programs. In *Bueno Center for Multicultural Education Monograph Series*, Vol. 9, No. 1 (pp. 1-16). Boulder, CO: University of Colorado.

Obiakor, F. E. (1994). *The eight-step multicultural approach: Learning and teaching with a smile*. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

Obiakor, F. E. (1995, May). Multiculturalism in the university curriculum: Infusion for what? *Resources in Education, 30*, 81. (ERIC Reproduction Service No. ED 377 766)

Obiakor, F. E., Algozzine, B., & Ford, B. A. (1993, October). Urban education, the General Education Initiative, and service delivery to African-American students. *Urban Education, 28*, 313-327.

Obiakor, F. E., Algozzine, B., & Ford, B. A. (1994). Education reform and service delivery to African-American students. In S. B. Garcia (Ed.), *Addressing cultural and linguistic diversity in special education: Issues and trends* (pp. 1-9). Reston, VA: The Council for Exceptional Children.

Obiakor, F. E., & Ford, B. A. (1995, April). *Restructuring and reforming: "Rat Race" for excellence or failure*? Paper presented at the 73rd Annual International Convention of the Council for Exceptional Children (CEC), Indianapolis, IN.

Obiakor, F. E., Prater, L. P., & Utley, C. (1996, November). *Shifting paradigms: Responding to cultural diversity in teacher preparation programs*. Paper presented at the 19th Annual Teacher Education Division (TED) Council for Exceptional Children Conference, Washington, DC.

Obiakor, F. E., Weaver, K., & Hoshino, J. (1996, October). *Shifting paradigms: Multicultural collaboration in teaching and learning*. Presentation series at the Regent's Conference on Diversity and Multiculturalism, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS.

Price, H. B. (1991, Fall). Multicultural education: The debate. *Humanities in the South, 24*, 1-8.

Samuelson, B., & Obiakor, F. E. (1995, February). Shifting the teaching paradigm for a multicultural world. *Faculty Developments*, p. 1.

Siccone, F. (1995). *Celebrating diversity: Building self-esteem in today's multicultural classrooms*. Boston, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Sleeter, C. E. (1992). *Keepers of the American dream: A study of staff development and multicultural education*. London, England: The Farmer Press.

Spring, J. (1995). *The intersection of cultures: Multicultural education in the United States*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Thomas, J. I., & Alawiye, O. (1990, September). *American elementary school texts: Dignity for blacks*? Paper presented at the National Social Science Association (NSSA) Conference, Washington, DC.

Trent, S. C. (1992, October). School choice for African-American children who live in poverty: A commitment to equity or more of the same? *Urban Education, 27*, 291-307.

Trent, S. C. (1995). Teacher preparation: The missing link in behavior management. In F. E. Obiakor & B. Algozzine (Eds.), *Managing problem behaviors: Perspectives for general and special educators* (pp. 207-239). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.

U.S. Department of Education. (1991). *America 2000: An education strategy*. Washington, DC: Author.

U.S. Department of Education (1994). *The Goals 2000: Educate America Act*. Washington, DC: Author.

Wald, J. L. (1996, Fall). Diversity in the special education teaching force. *National Clearinghouse for Professions in Special Education (NCPSE), 1*, 1-6.

Weis, L., & Fine, M. (1993). *Beyond silenced voices: Class, race, and gender in United States schools*. New York: State University of New York Press.

West, C. (1993). *Race matters*. New York: Vintage Books.

Forging Partnerships in Special Education to Enhance Collaboration Between Mexico and the United States

Todd Fletcher, Ph.D., Candace Bos, Ph.D., Sandra Engoron, Jean Favela, University of Arizona

Abstract

This paper highlights the increasing collaboration taking place between Mexico and the United States in the field of special education and rehabilitation and traces the development of collaborative conferences, symposiums and projects in this area. It details the process involved in the development of initiatives and action plans designed to enhance the understanding and improvement of programs for individuals from diverse backgrounds with special educational needs in both countries.

At this moment in the history of North America, there are extraordinary challenges, unique opportunities, and pressing problems which require dialogue and collaboration to resolve. In particular, Mexico and the United States are facing an inevitable process of integration and cooperation on many fronts. As the two nations move into the 21st century this "integration can be ignored and left to run its course uncontrolled by either country, or it can be resisted, managed or negotiated" (Pastor & Castaneda, p. 367). In the arena of education within the past few years there has been an overwhelming push toward collaboration in the form of student and faculty exchanges, collaborative research projects, scholar in residence programs, memoranda of understanding, cooperative and programmatic agreements and other collaborative educational ventures between departments of education, U.S. colleges and universities with their counterparts in Mexico and throughout Latin America.

The movement toward educational cooperation between Mexico and the U.S. was formally initiated in El Paso, Texas in August 1990 with the signing of an historic document by the former U.S. and Mexican Secretaries of Education. The U.S. and Mexican Departments of Education agreed upon a memorandum of understanding within the framework of the U.S. Binational Commission. The intent of the agreement was to enhance cooperation and collaboration between the two countries for the purpose of improving the quality of education. The collaborative nature of the agreement focused on teacher, university and student exchanges in the teaching of

Spanish and English, science and mathematics education, migrant education, literacy, dropout prevention, technical education, education technology and special education.

The need for collaboration in education between the United States and Mexico is accentuated by recent political and economic developments. The rapid pace of social and economical changes taking place in Mexico, accompanied by passage of the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) places increased demands on the educational systems in both the U.S. and Mexico. Mexico is the number one country of origin of immigrants both documented and undocumented. Since 1981 an estimated 1,655,000 Mexicans have emigrated to the United States legally (Figueroa & Garcia, 1994). The increasing number of Spanish-speaking immigrants poses significant challenges to our public education system. Limited knowledge of the these children's culture and language has resulted in inappropriate placement of children, under-achievement, high drop-out rates, and created barriers to social integration (Olsen, 1988). It is in the interest of U.S. educators to better understand the educational system from which many of these children come.

It was within this context the First Inter-American Symposium on Disability for the United States and Mexico was held in April 1994. The purpose of this chapter is to describe the process that was used to develop and conduct this joint venture between the two countries and to discuss further developments and outcomes resulting from this first symposium. Future directions for strengthening the partnership will also be discussed.

Purpose and Goals

The First Inter-American Symposium on Disability for the United States and Mexico set forth mechanisms for developing sustained dialogue and communication between Mexico and the United States on behalf of individuals with disabilities. The symposium started as a vision and belief in the potential of partnerships between Mexico and the United States and in creating opportunities for children, youth, and adults with disabilities. The symposium was a initial opportunity for leaders in education, rehabilitation, business, government, parent organizations, and advocacy groups from Mexico and the U.S. to come together to share knowledge and strengthen partnerships for advocacy, awareness, empowerment, and inclusion of individuals with disabilities and their families. The theme was "Families and Communities in Action: Commitment for the 21st Century" and embraced the United Nations 1994 declaration, "International Year of the Family".

The goals and expected outcomes of the symposium were:

a. Expand and develop partnerships and networks across institutions and businesses from the public and private sectors which promote the success of individuals with disabilities.

b. Foster advocacy, awareness, and empowerment for Hispanic and Mexican individuals with disabilities and their families.
c. Expand on-going communication across communities and countries through educational exchanges, study, and sharing of information and research.
d. Heighten the consciousness of business leaders regarding the potential of persons with disabilities for meaningful employment.
e. Share knowledge of successful programs that promote inclusion of children and youth with disabilities in the mainstream of the educational process.
f. Establish new coalitions for the Council for Exceptional Children, Very Special Arts, and the National Rehabilitation Association between the United States and Mexico.
g. Establish fellowships to provide educational exchanges and study between the United States and Mexico.
h. Publish and disseminate the action plans and initiatives from the symposium.
i. Reconvene a follow-up meeting on disability in Mexico City during 1995 for the purpose of reporting on the progress of the action plans and to further the cause of disability issues in Mexico.

Based on the goals and expected outcomes, key issues and ideas were generated that provided a conceptual framework around which keynote speakers, panelists, and working groups focused their attention. Questions addressed were:

a. How can we begin to develop collaborative working relationships and educational networks between the United States and Mexico to create greater opportunities for the education of persons with disabilities?
b. How can we create avenues to share resources?
c. How can the resources which already exist be utilized more effectively to solve problems and meet the needs of individuals with disabilities?
d. How can we integrate NAFTA with education from a visionary perspective and use NAFTA as a tool for creating greater educational opportunities for persons with disabilities?

The Planning Process

During the planning process for the symposium, several major guiding principles directed the work of the planning committees. One principle embraced the idea that leaders from both Mexico and the United States participate with equal status. At the heart of this principle was the belief that each country's participants had much to learn from each other. To embrace the notion of equal contributions from the two countries, U.S. and Mexico

planning committees were established. Six months before the symposium the two committees met together to make final decisions regarding the format of the symposium, featured keynote speakers and panelists from each country, as well as who the invited participants should include. This insured collaborative decision-making and consensus regarding the overall thrust of the symposium. This was a key element for giving ownership to each country's planning committee. It also provided a real sense of accomplishment as the planning process proceeded.

A second guiding principle focused on the need to address disability issues across the life-span, thereby engaging a number of professional and advocacy communities in the symposium and the planning process. These included vocational rehabilitation, educational institutions, businesses that have taken leadership roles in providing meaningful employment for individuals with disabilities, professional and parent organizations which target individuals with disabilities, government agencies, and non-profit foundations such as Very Special Arts. This broad orientation led to the development of four focus areas within the symposium: Families and Early Childhood, Education, the Arts, and Business and Employment.

A third guiding principle was that the participants should have the opportunity to obtain information across the four focus areas rather than only attending sessions in their designated area of expertise. To ensure that this principle was met, the symposium was designed so that the participants would attend all sessions, beginning the first morning with family and early childhood followed by business and employment, education, and the arts. This was viewed by many as an opportunity for growth. For example, a number of educators commented on how this format had increased their awareness of how art could provide positive influences on the lives of children and young adults with disabilities or how they could better interface with business and vocational rehabilitation.

A fourth principle was based on the active role that was envisioned for the participants. The one-hundred and sixty leaders who took part in the first symposium were participants, not attendees. Their responsibility was to develop action plans in each of the four focus areas. These plans would serve as blueprints for developing on-going relationships between the two countries. Throughout the two days, the participants met in their focus area groups and worked through a process to develop action plans that were then presented at the concluding session of the symposium.

The final guiding principle highlighted the important role that language played in the symposium. The planning committees in both countries did not want language differences to serve as a barrier to the success of the symposium, yet success would be measured by the opportunities participants from both countries would have to exchange beliefs and ideas. Three strategies were used to facilitate communication. First, a disability lexicon

(list of terms related to disability issues) in English and Spanish was developed by the committee and included in the symposium materials. The development of this lexicon was a significant outcome in and of itself, in that professionals and officials from both countries negotiated as to the "most acceptable" terms to use. For example, the term disability had been previously referred to in Mexico as "minusvalido" (Eng. trans. "less valid"). Patterned after the UNESCO conference held in Spain in 1994, the term that was agreed upon for Latin America was discapacidad" (Eng. trans. "disability"). The Appendix presents the lexicon that was developed for the symposium. Second, simultaneous translation was used for all sessions of the symposium. According to the translators, critical to their success was the development of the lexicon and receipt of major speeches prior to the symposium. The third strategy that facilitated communication was having bilingual facilitators during the sessions in which the action plans were developed. This appeared to increase the comfort level of participants in that they were understood regardless of the language in which they spoke and that their communication was translated so that all participants understood.

The Symposium

Audience and Format

The symposium format was designed to target three audiences. One audience was approximately 150 leaders from Mexico and the United States who participated in the entire symposium. These participants developed the actions plans and made a commitment to continue the networking and plans that were initiated at the symposium. A second audience was the local community including approximate 100 individuals including dignitaries and those individuals and representatives from organizations and businesses that made financial and inkind contributions to the symposium. The individuals were invited to attend the evening opening session so that persons in the Arizona community could profit from the symposium. The third audience was composed of approximately 50 local business leaders in Arizona and Sonora, Mexico, who attended a business and employment luncheon and the session on business and employment.

After the opening session and reception, four general sessions were held, one for each focus area. In each general session, keynote speeches were given by one leader from Mexico and one from the United States. For example, the Director of Special Education for Mexico and the Director of the Office of Bilingual Education and Language Minority Affairs for the United States gave the keynote addresses for the Education area. This was followed by a panel discussion. After each general session, the participants met in the focus areas groups to develop their action plans. The symposium ended with a closing session where proclamations were given and the action plans presented.

Action Planning Process

The primary objective of the symposium was the creation of action plans or initiatives, developed in collaborative working groups over the course of the symposium. Participants were invited to choose one of the four focus areas. Each focus area was composed of participants from Mexico and the United States, and each area had two bilingual facilitators and a recorder. Once participants joined a working group, they were strongly urged to remain in that particular focus area for the four working sessions, so that they could take part in the four stages of the action plan process (see Figure 1).

The objective of the first working session was to brainstorm ideas and identify possible areas of collaboration. Lap-top computers were used to record the ideas as they were generated. After this first hour-long session, facilitators organized the ideas and prepared copies to share with the participants in the second working session.

During the second session, participants reached consensus in the selection of three or four initiatives, for which action plans would be developed. Concrete steps for implementation, as well as the resources needed for each proposed initiative, were developed in the third working session. Again, after each working session, the facilitators organized the information and shared it with their respective group in the subsequent session.

The fourth and final working session was used to finalize and refine the collaborative action plans, with participants delineating timelines and identifying the key individuals and specific resources needed to carry out the specific identified steps of each initiative. The actions plans were later summarized and each initiative was placed on transparencies and shared with all participants during the closing session. After the symposium, the action plans were printed and a copy sent to each participant along with the addresses, and phone numbers of the participants.

Sharing the Culture

Throughout the course of the symposium, sharing and learning about the cultures occurred at various levels, whether participants listened to formal keynote addresses and panel discussions (facilitated by simultaneous translation), working groups developed action plans, or groups of participants casually chatted over a meal. Two examples highlight the cultural learning that occurred during the focus area sessions. In the first focus area session, the goal was to brainstorm ideas for possible initiatives. The assumption was that everyone in the group would be accustomed to this common U.S. activity of brainstorming, that is, simply putting forth ideas quickly and in quantity, without debate or judgment about the input. What was soon evidenced was that many participants from Mexico were using this brainstorming session for discussing the ideas as they were presented. Acknowledging the different concept of brainstorming allowed for making

adjustments and working through differences. Participants from the U.S., on the other hand, experienced a degree of difficulty in understanding the different attitudes towards the concept of collaboration which their Mexican counterparts exhibited. Many of the U.S. participants were not aware of the substantial differences between the ir respective educational systems, nor were they cognizant of the social and historical forces which have contributed to the unique evolvement of the Mexican educational system. The structural and cultural characteristics of the Mexican system compel Mexican educators to approach bi-national collaboration in a different manner, particularly as educational policies in Mexico are presently in flux and are taking unforeseen directions. Nevertheless, despite differences in perceptions, the atmosphere was one of mutual respect and interest in forging partnerships and promoting a better life for people with disabilities.

Because of the intensity of the sessions, and the active role for participants, the opening reception and entertainment allowed participants to relax and get to know each other better, as well as to share experiences. A number of the talented artists who participated in the symposium shared their talents during a Mexican Fiesta held the second evening of the symposium. Music and dance became a unifying factor, as cultures were blended together in a spirit of hope, joy, and oneness.

Rewards and Challenges

Outcomes and Rewards

The First Inter-American Symposium on Disability has led to many positive outcomes and new developments. During the symposium, numerous professional ties were made between individuals from the two countries. The networking has continued to grow as the initiatives and ideas formulated during the symposium move from plans on paper to actions by individuals.

The action plans and initiatives developed by the participants in the four focus areas attests to the breadth of the needs and issues surrounding the improvement of life for children and adults with disabilities. At the same time commonalities were evident across the action plans developed in the four areas. The central theme of the symposium "Families and Communities in Action" emphasized the importance of family involvement and participation and the need for early intervention. One initiative that was set into motion by the Families and Early Childhood focus area group was the creation of an Arizona Fiesta Educativa, a Latino parent organization for parents who have children with disabilities. Tied to these efforts were the goals of collaborating with similar organizations across the border in Sonora. Another initiative was in the area of assessment. With the number of families traveling across the border increasing, the need for understanding each other's assessment instruments is important. Not only were instruments to

be shared but a follow-up meeting was scheduled so that additional persons from Arizona and Sonora could participate.

Like the other focus areas, participants in the education focus group expressed concerns and generated many ideas during the brainstorming session. From the myriad of suggestions, several emerged as viable initiatives. One was the formation of a task force aimed at investigating ways of facilitating the certification and endorsement in the United Sates of special education teachers from Mexico, in the United States. Another proposed initiative was the development of a networking system across the U.S. and Mexico for the distribution and sharing of materials, journals, and evaluation instruments. Closely related to this initiative was an initiative promoting greater collaboration and linkage between disability organizations in the U.S. and Mexico such as the Council for Exceptional Children and Very Special Arts for the purpose of disseminating information. At a grass roots level, individual special education teachers from Mexico and the U.S. made commitments to meet to exchange ideas about methods and educational programs for students with special needs. The director of special education from Mexico City made a commitment to send all government published books on special education to date to the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation at the University of Arizona where they would be housed.

Similar to the other areas, the participants in the Arts area also set in motion the development of an instructional resources centers with a focus on the Mexican and Southwestern cultures. Aware of the growing need for bilingual arts education materials, they highlighted this area. They also initiated a list of artists and art educators from the two countries (particularly Southwestern United States and Northern Mexico) to serve as resources. Benefits from this initiative have already been received by a group of children with disabilities and their special education teachers in Mexico City who participated in a week long Artist in Residence program in stained glass. Similarly, a workshop in mask making designed for students with visual impairments was conducted both in Tucson and Hermosillo. The relationships fostered at the symposium between key leaders in Very Special Arts Arizona, Very Special Arts Mexico, and Very Special Arts Sonora facilitated this project. The participants also set forth an initiative to identify artists with disabilities and develop avenues for marketing their art in both countries. Since the symposium, the work of the Arizona artists that was shown at the Very Special Arts in Washington, D.C. has traveled to Hermosillo, Sonora for a follow-up show in their Center for Culture.

In the area of Business and Employment, one of the most meaningful outcomes focused on the area of accessibility. Many of the Mexican participants in the symposium chose to participate in tours conducted the day preceding the symposium. They toured model programs in vocational re-

habilitation and businesses that have been leaders in employing individuals with disabilities. For some of the Mexican visitors, it was the first time they had the opportunity to explore firsthand programs and facilities that were so accessible to individuals with disabilities. Two participants from Mexico who direct the Libre Acceso (Free Access) Project have begun to integrate their new-found knowledge into their work to make government buildings and historical sites accessible to individuals with physical disabilities in the city of Oaxaca. Another outcome which resulted from this initial symposium was the development of the US/Mexico Disability Resource Center Consortium. This consortium is comprised of professionals from the U.S. and Mexico and meets on a regular basis to explore new avenues of funding for program development to enhance collaboration between our two countries. The orientation and focus of the consortium is directed toward assessment of and delivery of resources in employment and vocational areas. A consortium member was recently awarded a grant from the Kellogg Foundation to expand this on-going collaboration with Libre Acceso in Oaxaca, Mexico mentioned previously.

In addition, the consortium recently received a three year grant from the Funds for the Improvement of Post Secondary Education agency (FIPPSE) entitled the North American Consortium for Disability Services and Human Development: Valuing Disability, Ethnic, and Gender Differences for Human Rights and Economic Development. The specific objectives of the project are to: (1) promote academic exchanges for 50 students across Mexico, Canada and the United States; (2) provide learning opportunities for participants in the social, cultural and economic issues faced by women, minorities and individuals with disabilities in the three countries; and (3) examine issues of credential mg of human resource development and human service professionals encountered during their collaborative educational exchanges across the three countries.

As part of the first symposium, businesses and service providers in this area demonstrated both high and low technology. As stated by one Mexican participant, "We had no idea how technology is contributing to the elimination of what appears to be insurmountable physical and social barriers." This allows individuals with disabilities to better utilize their potential and to fully integrate into society, assuming roles of increasing importance.

One of the most significant outcomes of the symposium was a commitment from Mexico to host an International Congress on Disabilities. The "First International Congress -Disability in the Year 2000" was held May 31 - June 2, 1995 in Mexico City. The event was co-sponsored by The University of Arizona, Universidad de las Americas in Mexico City, Very Special Arts Mexico, and the National System for the Integral Development of the Family (DIF). The primary purpose of this Congress was to raise the awareness level of Mexicans regarding recognition of civil and human rights for

individuals with disabilities. The three themes of the plenary session of the Congress were (a) legislation and human rights, (b) education, art and recreation and (c) job training and employment. This Congress highlighted the rights of individuals with disabilities with the President of Mexico, Sr. Ernesto Zedillo, delivering the closing address. One of the unique features of this Congress was that for the first time, the disability organizations in Mexico worked together on a common goal. The result was quite rewarding, with more than 2,500 educators, service providers, professionals, and individuals with disabilities attending and Mexican President Zedillo announcing that disability rights and education would be a feature of his reform platform.

A follow-up to this congress was the convening of the U.S./Mexico Symposium on Disability held April 1996 in Tucson. Delegations from both countries including the U.S. Assistant Secretary for Special Education and Rehabilitation and the Special Advisor to the Secretary of Public Education in Mexico for Special Education attended. The symposium entitled "Blending the Mexican and Native American Cultures Through Collaboration Between the U.S. and Mexico for Individuals with Disabilities and Their Families" was a follow-up "think-tank" symposium sponsored by the University of Arizona and grant from the National Institute for Disability Related Research designed to provide a core group of leading experts and consumers/practitioners the opportunity to meet and discuss the continuing development of collaborative programs, policies, and practices between Mexico and the United States for individuals with disabilities and their families, particularly native peoples. The outcomes from this symposium included (1) a consumer-oriented policy and practice resource book based on the symposium; (2) an edited volume on current and recommended practices and policies related to the two countries working collaboratively to support the culture and lives of individuals with disabilities in the two countries; (3) presentation of the issues and outcomes generated at the symposium at the Second International Congress on Disabilities held in Mexico City in March, 1997; and (4) the establishment of an education and rehabilitation resource center which will house materials and information related to Mexico and the U.S. collaborative issues around individuals with disabilities and their families.

It was during this symposium that the government official from the Mexican Department of Education made a commitment to sponsor a conference on the special needs of indigenous peoples in Oaxaca, Mexico, August 1996 entitled "The Indigenous Vision of the Social and Academic Integration of Individuals with Disabilities". This was an historic first for the country of Mexico in which the departments of Indigenous Education and Special Education in the Mexican Department of Education collaborated and co-sponsored an event related to indigenous peoples and disabilities.

Native peoples from the United States and Mexico participated in a forum discussing issues of mutual concern in both countries.

A number of additional benefits have resulted from the symposiums. These include particular benefits from public school and professional preparation perspectives. From the perspective of the public schools, the symposiums provided a valuable opportunity for educators to gain mutual understanding of educational programs in the United States and Mexico, for the purpose of better serving Mexican students and their families in both countries. Many public school districts, especially those with close proximity to the Mexican border, receive a significant number of Mexican students, some of which have disabilities. Awareness of students' educational and sociocultural antecedents oftentimes prevent unnecessary barriers and dissolve misconceptions. Sensitivity and awareness on the part of educators can help in building trust with parents, thus, promoting a more positive and collaborative working relationship.

For example, a possible misconception about Mexican students might be that they come from an underdeveloped or unprogressive school system. During one of the summer planning sessions for the symposium, a group of educators and counselors from Hermosillo, Sonora described the educational program developed for various rural schools in the state. The "programa integrado" or "integrated program" which the Hermosillo teachers described proved to be an inclusion program for students with special needs in general education classrooms. These presenters stated that, out of necessity, many rural schools in Mexico have been using inclusion programs for a number of years. Ironically, they have already worked through some of the controversies and barriers that we are currently encountering in U.S. public schools.

Multicultural experiences that teachers have during their professional preparation have significant impact on how they teach and the degree to which they understand and foster respect for individuals from diverse cultures (Garcia, 1994). The symposium itself, grew out of an on-going partnership that has developed between the University of Arizona and the Universidad de las Americas. The climate of cooperation, receptivity and trust which facilitated the development of partnerships and networks across the two nations was based on a mutual understanding and respect of one another.

This partnership and memorandum of agreement between universities has facilitated faculty and student exchanges, particularly in special education and bilingual education programs. For example, students from the U.S. can participate in "Verano en Mexico," a University of Arizona summer study program, held in cooperation with the Universidad de las Americas in Mexico City. Course work includes classes in special education, bilingual education, and Mexican culture. Students participating in the program ob-

serve and teach children and youth and work with families of these children. The transfer of credits is facilitated by the fact that the Universidad de las Americas is recognized by the Southern Association of Schools and Colleges accrediting agency.

Challenges and Opportunities

The U.S. and Mexico are experiencing a period of integration, collaboration, and cooperation never before witnessed in the history of the two countries. A number of efforts toward collaboration and cooperation in the area of disabilities, like those mentioned have been made during the last several years. For those who have initiated such efforts, the key to their long term success is identifying and confronting the challenges associated with building infrastructure, changing policies and practices, and opening and maintaining lines of communication. Such vehicles as technology, regional educational centers and consortia, border education commissions, and cooperative agreements fostering transnational teacher certification allow for the transfer of knowledge and the movement of resources and qualified individuals between Mexico and the United States. Regardless of the infrastructure, hard work and commitment of individuals with a shared vision for change is the key to success.

The Mexican Perspective

From a Mexican perspective, this is an ideal time in the development of special education and civil and human rights for individuals with disabilities in Mexico to form partnerships between Mexico and the United States. First, with the signing of NAFTA, the barriers to sharing human and material resources are being reduced. Second, President Zedillo, the current president of Mexico, has set forth as goals in his campaign and presidency, the empowerment of individuals with disabilities and related access, employment, and education issues. In his closing remarks at the First International Congress - Disability in the Year 2000" in Mexico City he indicated a substantial level of commitment and support toward these goals. Third, with the Education Reform Act of 1993, enacted by President Salinas, central planning and the central dictating of policies has been substituted by regional administration in which decision making can more realistically respond to local needs and goals.

The first symposium took place within the context of changing policies and the emerging Mexican agenda focusing on the human and civil rights for individuals with disabilities. One example of the changing context was demonstrated in the speech given by the Director of Special Education for Mexico. Mr. Eliseo Guajardo spoke of the growing needs in Mexico in that only 1 % of the total number of children in need of special education in Mexico, is actually receiving special education services. He also addressed the challenges that are common across both countries including the impor-

tance of individualized planning and programming, as well as inclusion into regular education classrooms. He charged participants, particularly those from Mexico, to participate in the upgrading of education in Mexico and to develop, adapt, and implement more efficient educational approaches that meet the social, economical, and political contexts of the various regions. One Mexican educator commented, "Given the traditional central, top-down administration orientation in Mexico, this was a major step forward for Mexican education."

During the U.S./Mexico Symposium on Disability in 1996, Maria Angelica Luna Parra, assistant director of Mexico's agency for assistance and coordination of the National System for the Integral Development of the Family (DIF) reinforced statements made in the first symposium noting that the "blending of two cultures engaged in a common purpose to change government agendas is a revolution." She added that as a result of the increased public awareness of disabilities issues in Mexico, legislative change has been initiated on state and national levels with 11 states having passed legislation and ten other states with legislation pending.

Conclusion

These series of conferences and symposia have taken place within the context of the changing social, educational, economical, and political policies in both countries and the emerging Mexican agenda focusing on human and civil rights for individuals with disabilities. Initiated by the Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation at the University of Arizona in 1994, leading disabilities professionals and advocates in the U.S. and Mexico have worked as equal partners in developing, adapting, and implementing plans and programs to improve the education of individuals with disabilities in both societies.

The two societies and economies of Mexico and the United States are facing common and unique issues related to disabilities and human and civil rights. Individuals with disabilities must be recognized for their talents and contributions to society. The achievement of full recognition of the inherent and invaluable differences that all human beings possess will determine our future. We live in a increasingly interdependent world which requires collaboration and cooperation to solve the problems that confront us. Over the past few years professionals, individuals with disabilities and their families from both countries have worked cooperatively to problem solve and implement initiatives in the best interests of individuals from diverse backgrounds with special educational needs. The spirit of collaboration characterized throughout the planning and implementation of the First Inter-American Symposium on Disability and subsequent events is one example of the type of collaboration that will propel us toward even greater accomplishments as we move into the 21st century.

References

Figueroa, R., & Garcia, E. (1994). Issues in testing students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds. *Multicidtural Education, 2*(1), 10-19.

Garcia, E. (1994). *Understanding and meeting the challenge of student cultural diversity*. Princeton, NJ: Houghton Mifflin.

Olsen, L. (1988). *Crossing the schoolhouse border: Immigrant students and the California public schools* (California Tomorrow Policy Research Report) San Francisco: California Tomorrow.

Pastor, R., & Castaneda, J. (1988). *Limits to friendship: The United Statas and Mexico*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf.

Notes

For more information regarding symposium related activities and events contact Dr. Todd Fletcher, Department of Special Education and Rehabilitation, University of Arizona, Tucson, Arizona 87521.

About the Authors

Todd Fletcher is an assistant professor at in bilingual/multicultural special education at the University of Arizona. His teaching and research interests include the assessment and instruction of language minority students with learning disabilities and cross-national collaboration in special education, particularly with Mexico.

Candace Bos is a professor of special education at the University of Arizona. Her teaching and research interests include using interactive models of teaching and learning for instruction of students with learning disabilities including language minority students.

Sandra Engoron is a doctoral student in special education at the University of Arizona. Her interests focus on building family and community support networks to support Latino students with disabilities and their families.

Jean Favela is the director of bilingual education in Sunnyside School District and a doctoral student at the University of Arizona. Her interests focus on building collaborative relationships to better serve Latino and Native American students with disabilities, including cross-country collaboration.

ACTION PLAN DEVELOPMENT SHEET

(Education, Families & Early Childhood, Business & Employment, The Arts)

Session 1 OBJECTIVE *Brainstorm and identify areas of collaboration*

Session 2 OBJECTIVE *Reach consensus on three or four initiatives*

Select 304 initiatives for which your group is committed to developing an action plan.

1.

2.

3.

4.

Session 3 OBJECTIVE *Develop and outline concrete steps for implementation and the resources needed*

Outline specific steps in facilitating and accomplishing collaborative ideas.

Session 4 OBJECTIVE *Finalize collaborative action plans*

For each initiative list overall recommendations and provide specific timelines detailing the key individuals, when and how the initiative is to be implemented, and the resources necessary for implementation.

Figure 1. Action plan development sheet used by collaborative working groups.

APPENDIX

First Inter-American Symposium on Disabilities for the United States and Mexico List of Term Equivalencies	Primer Simposio Interamericano Entre Mexico y los Estados Unidos Para Personas con Discapacidades Lista de Terminos Equivalentes
adaptations	adaptaciones
adaptive techniques	tecnicas adaptativas
adaptive behavior	conductas adaptativas
adaptive tools	herrarnientas (de adaptacion)
APA = American Psychological Association (U.S.)	Asociacion Americana de Psicologia
assessment	evaluacion
assistive technology	tecnologfa de apoyo
at-risk children	ninos en riesgo
audiology	audiologfa
auditory discrimination	discriminacion auditiva
behavior management plan	plan de control de la conducta
borderline	limftrofe (area fronteriza)
CEC = Council for Exceptional Children (U.S.)	Consejo para Ninos Excepcionales
certification	certificacion
child-find and screening	localizacion de nijios y deteccion
cognitive development	desarrollo cognitivo
cognitive skills	habilidades cognitivas
communication development	desarrollo de la comunicacion
concrete experiences	experiencias concretas
continuum I continuo	continuo
critical thinking	pensamiento critico
dance	danzatbaile
delays	retrasos
D.E.S. = Department of Economic Security (Arizona)	Departamento de Seguridad Economica
developmentally appropriate practices	practicas apropiadas para el desarrollo
Family Development Services	D.I.F. = Desarrollo Integral de la Familia Mexico)
early childhood	infancia
early intervention	intervencion temprana
empower	dar vozifortalecer (en relacion a poder)
enable	facilitar
enhance	acentuarlaumentar/mejorar
fetal alcohol syndrome	Sindrome de alcoholismo fetal
fine and gross motor	motor fino y grueso
goals and objectives	metas y objectivos
hearing impairment	impedimento auditivo
higher order thinking skills	procesos cognitivos de alto nivel

I.D.E.A. - P.L. 94-142 (United States)	Ley de Educacion para Individuos con Discapacidades I Ley Publica 94-142
I.Q.	cociente intelectual
implications	implicaciones
inclusive	inclusivo
individual education plan	plan educativo individual
infant/toddler	bebe infante
integrated learning	aprendizaje integrado
itinerant	intinerante
knowledge	conocimiento
language disordered	con alteracion de lenguaje
Language Experience approach	enfoque de Experiencia de Lenguaje
learning problems	problemas para aprender
learning disabilities	problemas de aprendizaje
lesson plans	planes de clase
life skills	habilidades para la vida
literacy development	desarrollo de la lectoescritura
literacy	alfabetizacion I lengua escrita
marketable	comerciable
mentally retarded	retrasado mental
modality	modalidad
moderate delay	retraso moderado
moderate	moderado
movement	movimiento
multi-handicapped	con discapacidades multiples
multicultural	multicultural
muscular dystrophy	distrofia muscular
NABE = National Association of Bilingual Education (U.S.)	Asociacion Nacional para la Educacion Bilingue
OBEMLA = Office of Bilingual Education and Minority language Affairs (U.S.)	Oficina de Educacion Bilingue y Asuntos de Minorfas Linguisticas
opera/music theatre	opera/teatro musical
paraplegic	paraplegico
paraprofessionals	paraprofesionales
physical disability	discapacidad fisica
physical development	desarrollo fisica
preschool severe delay	retraso severo en el desarrollo del preescolar
preschool	preescolar
problem-solving	proceso de soluci6n de problemas
procedures	procedimientos
psychosocial	psicosocial
rationale	justificacion
reading/writing development	desarrollo de lengua escrita
resource-room	salon de apoyo pedagogico
screening process	proceso de deteccion
self-contained	auto contenidol segregado

Secretariat of Public Education Mexico)	S.E.P. = Secretarfa de Educacion Publica
service sites	centros de servicio
severe	severo
skills	habilidades
social skills	habilidades sociales
sociolemotional development	desarrollo social y emocional
sound-symbol relationship	correspondencia grafema-fonema
speech/language delay	retraso del habla y lenguaje
standardized tests	pruebas estandarizadas
strategies	estrategias
theater	teatro
training	entrenamiento
transition	transicion
trends	tendencias
visual arts	artes plasticas
visual discrimination	discriminacion visual
visual impairment	impedimento visual
visual-motor	visuo-motriz
whole language	Lenguaje Integral